DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 213 SO 013 674

TITLE US/USSR Textbook Study Project, Interim Report.
INSTITUTION American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Washington, D.C.; Association of American Publishers, New York, N.Y.; Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.; Ministry of Education, Moscow (USSR).; National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.; International Communication Agency, Washington, D.C.; National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.; William and Mary Greve Foundation, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Jun 81
NOTE 213p.; Appendix B entitled "Program for the Conference of American and Soviet Participants in the Textbook Study, Moscow, June, 1979" may not reproduce clearly from EDRS in microfiche or paper copy due to small and fading print type of original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Comparative Education; Foreign Countries; *Geography Instruction; *History Textbooks; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; *Textbook Content; *Textbook Evaluation; Textbook Preparation; Textbook Research
IDENTIFIERS United States; USSR

ABSTRACT

This interim report, intended to help textbook authors and publishers, describes the results of a project in which American schools critiqued Soviet textbooks and Soviet scholars critiqued American textbooks. Secondary level history and geography texts were the focus of the study. There are five chapters to the report: Background to the Study; American Criticisms of Soviet Textbooks; Soviet Criticisms of American Textbooks; Recommendations for the Revision of American and Soviet Textbooks; and Conclusions and Recommendations. The report's conclusions state that there are a few ways in which books in the two nations can be judged similarly deficient. Both American and Soviet textbooks tend to: glorify the accomplishments of their own nation and to denigrate the contributions of others; feature the least attractive aspects of life in the other nation; emphasize political affairs and devote scant attention to social and cultural life in the other country; and to be written from a Cold War perspective. Recommendations made include the following. When treating a topic involving a dispute between the United States and the USSR, authors should include information about how the issue is interpreted in the other country. Authors should strive to use the most accurate up-to-date information. When discussing disputes that have arisen over violations of treaties and other agreements, textbook authors should provide the texts of the relevant portions of agreements in the texts so that students can judge for themselves the extent of violations that have occurred. Emotional and pejorative language should be avoided. Respect for the national traditions and customs of the other country should be encouraged. (Author/RM)

ED210213

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NCSS
Elizabeth Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

US/USSR TEXTBOOK STUDY PROJECT

Interim Report

June, 1982

SP013674

A Project of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the Association of American Publishers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the USSR Ministry of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xi

CHAPTER

I BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY. 1

Introduction 1

Procedures 9

II AMERICAN CRITICISMS OF SOVIET TEXTBOOKS 21

Some General Problems Involving the Analyses of History and Geography Textbooks 26

Some Topics Deserving Improved Treatment in Soviet History Textbooks. 41

Some Topics Deserving Improved Treatment in Soviet Geography Textbooks. 65

Conclusions: What Soviet Youth Know About the United States From Their History and Geography Textbooks 73

III SOVIET CRITICISM OF AMERICAN TEXTBOOKS 77

Part I. Presentation of Soviet History From the October Revolution to the Present . . 77

Part II. Pre-Soviet Period 117

Part III. Geography of the USSR 123

Part IV. Summary -- Recommendations on Improvements in US History and Geography Textbooks 133

IV RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REVISION OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET TEXTBOOKS 147

Recommendations for Improving American Geography and History Textbooks. 148

Recommendations for Improving Soviet Geography and History Textbooks 159

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 171

APPENDICES:

A. List of American and Soviet Textbooks

B. Program for June 1979 Conference in Moscow

C. Protocol of June 1979 Moscow Conference

D. American Participants in the US/USSR Textbook Study Project

E. Soviet Participants in the US/USSR Textbook Study Project

PREFACE

The US/USSR Textbook Study Project has four main purposes: to mount an analysis of the geography and history textbooks used in schools in the United States and the USSR, to report the findings of these reviews, to offer recommendations regarding needed changes in textbook treatments, and to undertake reasonable and proper steps to encourage textbook improvements. These purposes are to be satisfied by two main tasks: the preparation of detailed criticisms of individual textbooks and the development of a report to be disseminated in both nations, containing the results of the textbook reviews and the recommendations for textbook revisions.

The first task was completed two years ago. Reviews of American and Soviet textbooks were exchanged during spring, 1979 and discussed at a Moscow conference in June, 1979. Copies of individual textbook reviews have been sent to the respective publishers for their use in planning future revisions of their books.

The second task has not been accomplished and is unlikely to be concluded in the immediate future. For reasons specified below, we have been unable to complete a report that can be disseminated widely in both nations. The present document, termed an "interim report," serves as a temporary expedient to a final report. Drawing upon information produced to this date, it pro-

vides an account of the background to the project and its methods of operation; it offers detailed criticism by American scholars of Soviet textbooks and by Soviet scholars of American textbooks; it contains recommendations for improvements in history and geography textbooks in both countries and gives suggestions for further work that should be undertaken. It is the foundation for a final report and must serve the function of a final report for the American funding agencies and association sponsors. However, the Soviet Ministry of Education has no obligation to disseminate its Russian version in the USSR; nor will this report be given general distribution in the United States. Further negotiations are necessary before a final report satisfactory to both the parties can be published and distributed widely in the two countries.

However, work on a final report and the preparation of textbook reviews are not the only steps the project has taken to satisfy the four purposes noted earlier. We have arranged face-to-face meetings involving American and Soviet scholars, educators, textbook authors, and editors; we have made presentations about the project at national meetings of relevant professional associations; we have cooperated with newspaper reporters and journal authors who have published popular pieces about our work; and we contributed articles about project findings to the April, 1981 edition of Social Education. Nevertheless, this interim report is the most comprehensive publication to date about the project.

Until a final report can be completed, this document will stand as a report of our accomplishments.

Factors that Have Affected this Report

The project began in 1977 when cooperation between the United States and the USSR across a range of activities was near its zenith; it draws to a close when political relations have deteriorated to their lowest level in more than a decade. Despite these changes, fluctuations in the political climate have had no visible effect on the project's goals. Indeed, if there had been effects, it would likely have been in the direction of increasing their importance, because during a time of rising paranoia and misunderstanding, it is even more essential that schools in both countries strive to provide youth with the most balanced, up-to-date, unprejudiced accounts possible about the other nation's society and culture. Ignorance and miscalculation pose their greatest hazards during periods of intense military rivalry.

While the project's goals have been largely unaffected by events of the recent past, this cannot be said for the conditions under which the two sides have sought to carry out the project's mission. Prior to December, 1979, the two sides enjoyed close, friendly collaboration. Whatever problems that arose were largely those that could be expected when scholars attempt to overcome language barriers, cultural differences, and skepticism bred by decades of suspicion. But the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and

the American response had a devastating impact on project working conditions. The last face-to-face meeting between representatives of the two sides occurred in November, 1979, when three members of the Soviet Textbook Commission took part in the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. Since December, 1979, the two sides have had no communication except by letter and cable. Although they exchanged preliminary drafts of a proposed final report during January and February, 1980, the meeting of the two delegations planned for March, 1980 in the United States was postponed indefinitely. This meeting, which would have followed a similar conference that took place in Moscow in June, 1979, would have enabled all of the American and Soviet participants in the project to discuss their findings and to reach consensus on the content of a joint, final report.

This interim report, then, is different from the final report that was conceived in June, 1979, when members of the two teams conferred in Moscow. At that time they agreed to produce a "joint report," one that would be published in identical form in English and in Russian and distributed widely in the two nations. They agreed on an outline for the report and assigned responsibility for drafting various portions. They agreed that each team would assume sole responsibility for writing those chapters that contained their criticisms of the textbooks used in the other nation, and each team would attend to the criticisms of the other side and then offer recommendations for changes in the textbooks used in its own

classrooms. This meant that the Soviet team would accept the responsibility for preparing criticisms of American textbooks (see Chapter III of this report) and for offering recommendations for changes in Soviet textbooks based upon their appraisal of American concerns. The American team would produce criticisms of Soviet textbooks (see Chapter II of this report) and offer suggestions to American authors and publishers for changes in American textbooks, based in part upon Soviet reviews and in part on American reviews of the same texts. Other parts of the report were to be written jointly. While each side would prepare and exchange preliminary drafts for sections to be jointly written at the meeting planned for March, 1980, the two drafts for these sections were to be rewritten later and consolidated into a single draft.

Inability to confer with one another after the exchange of preliminary drafts and the problems posed by attempting to negotiate changes through correspondence have prevented the preparation of a final report. However, rather than concluding the project with no report at all or forestalling the possibility of ultimately completing a joint report, we decided to prepare this interim report. The following judgments guided our work on the preparation of this report:

1. It is necessary to preserve a record of our work. The federal and private foundations that have supported the project, as well as the four association sponsors,

deserve a report on what has been accomplished.

2. It is unnecessary -- and probably unwise -- to disseminate an interim report so long as the completion of a joint, final report is possible. Beyond the copies provided the various funding agencies and association sponsors, we do not intend to disseminate this report.

3. The need for an interim report can be separated from a decision to continue or to terminate the project. While funds are exhausted, additional funds might be found to renew project activity should the political climate improve. It may be possible for representatives of the two sides to meet in the future in order to reach agreement on the text of a final report. For the present, the project will continue in a dormant state, ready to resume work when the situation warrants.

4. The interim report conforms as closely as possible to the format of the proposed final report agreed to by the two sides in June, 1979. This interim report deviates from the original format in two main respects: 1) the original chapters One and Two have been merged into a single chapter (Chapter I); and 2) the original Chapter III has been divided into two chapters (Chapters II and III).

5. To the degree possible this report draws upon the preliminary documents exchanged by the two sides in prepara-

tion for the final report. Except for minor editorial changes aimed at enhancing clarity and perfecting grammar, those chapters of the report that were the individual responsibility of the two teams have been reproduced as they first appeared in preliminary drafts. We realize that each side might have made further improvements in their first drafts, if they had been able to confer directly. However, not utilizing the original drafts, but instead producing an edited, American version of the Soviet preliminary draft for example, would have deprived the American reader of the Soviet perspective as they provided it. Producing the Soviet draft intact also ensures that the views of the Soviet team are expressed in the manner it preferred, at least at the time the preliminary draft was prepared.

Those chapters that were to have been jointly written (present chapters I and V) draw upon points expressed in both the American and Soviet preliminary drafts. It is impossible to assert confidently that members of the Soviet team would approve all that is now contained in these chapters. However, an effort was made to include Soviet points of view -- and even to label them as such where appropriate -- within the general flow of the narrative. The result has been a text that borrows from the preliminary versions of both

the American and Soviet drafts, although the style and approach follows most closely that represented in the preliminary draft prepared by the American team.

The result is that this interim report is neither entirely an "American report" nor a "joint American-Soviet report." It is a compromise of these two alternatives. Whatever awkwardness may have resulted, the report fulfills its current mission. It describes the project's work, reports the results of the textbook reviews, and offers suggestions for the improvement of textbooks in both nations. It also provides the basis for a published final report should the opportunity arise to complete the project's work.

Howard D. Mehlinger
Director, US/USSR Textbook Study Project

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report, as well as the Project's work throughout its existence, has depended upon the contributions of many people and organizations. These dependencies begin with Soviet colleagues in the USSR. We have been impressed by the scholarly manner in which the Soviet Textbook Commission has approached our mutual task and have thoroughly enjoyed the friendly, cooperative spirit in which we have been able to work. We are especially grateful to M. I. Zhuravleva, Deputy Minister for Foreign Relations of the USSR Ministry of Education and members of her staff; Iu. Iu. Ivanov, a member of the Soviet Commission and its director during the project's first stages; and Alexei L. Narochnitsky, the most recent head of the Soviet Textbook Commission. These individuals plus many other Soviet educators and scholars have contributed much to our knowledge of the Soviet educational system and our capacity to interpret Soviet textbooks.

Many Americans have assisted this project in important ways. All members of the American "team" (the Advisory Committee and Reader Panel) have contributed variously. Within this group Robert Carlson, who also serves as Associate Director of the project, and John Thompson deserve special mention. Other American scholars have assisted who are not formally members of the American team. Some of these are historians who provided critical reviews of passages from Soviet textbooks and who prepared position papers

for the Moscow conference. Ben Eklof and Nadia Peterson, colleagues at Indiana University, have been enormously helpful throughout the project in providing translations and assisting in the interpretation of Soviet texts.

The project is sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the American Association of Publishers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Council for the Social Studies. The support of the officers and staff of these organizations has been vital. The role NCSS has played is particularly important, as it has served as the fiscal agent for the project.

The American half of the effort has been supported by the Ford Foundation, the William and Mary Greve Foundation, the International Communication Agency, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Without their generous support the project could have done nothing. It is also important to note the helpful advice, encouragement, and support we have received from officials in the International Communication Agency, the Department of State, and the American embassy in Moscow.

Finally, I wish to draw particular attention to my secretary, Eve Russell, who has looked after many details relating to the project and who has been responsible for typing most of the American documents, including this final report.

A great many people have contributed to the project's success. This report is based upon their ideas and suggestions -- and in

many cases the actual words they have written for reviews, background papers, and preliminary drafts. I am deeply grateful to all of my American and Soviet colleagues.

Howard D. Mehlinger
Director, US/USSR Textbook Study Project

CHAPTER I -- BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The function of school courses in history and geography is much the same in every country. Such courses are intended to impart knowledge about the world and to influence the attitudes of youth toward their own country and other nations. Decisions about what knowledge to teach and which attitudes to affect are significant because they ultimately influence people's perceptions of contemporary events and prompt judgments about the motivations of other countries. To some degree what is taught in history and geography courses can influence relationships among nations.

Students depend upon textbooks as their primary source of history and geography information. While good teachers are seldom constrained by textbooks and while a textbook by itself cannot provide all of the information students require, nevertheless textbooks typically establish the instructional agenda. They are the source of examination questions, and teachers are expected to help students learn the information textbooks contain.

American and Soviet educators believe that history and geography textbooks used in their countries have some influence on US-Soviet relations. What students learn from their textbooks can contribute to or detract from efforts aimed at improving relationships. This is not to imply that conflicts between the two countries are merely the products of misunderstanding. The United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are two, highly competitive nation-states. They give priority to different values; they embrace different and

conflicting world perspectives; and they hold different images of the future. But despite their differences and the inevitability of continuing competition, neither benefits from misinformation and unreasonable fear because these can lead to miscalculations, misinterpretation of motivations, and mistaken responses to the actions of the other side: all contribute to making the world even more dangerous than it needs to be. To seek accurate knowledge of the other country does not imply approval of its policies, but reliable knowledge is essential for building respect and for guiding wise political judgments.

For sound educational reasons and in the hope that their efforts might ultimately contribute to improved relations, American and Soviet historians, geographers, and educational authorities established a project in 1977 to review history and geography textbooks used by teachers and students in their respective countries. This report, one result of their mutual collaboration, is intended to provide help to textbook authors and publishers in both nations as they undertake revisions of current books and begin planning new textbooks to be published in the future.

International Efforts to Improve Textbooks

The notion that school textbooks are important in affecting relationships among nations is a fairly old idea. More than 50 years ago, following World War I, educators sought the reform of nationalistic textbooks as one way to avoid future wars of the kind they had

recently experienced. Through agencies associated with the League of Nations and other international organizations as well as through bilateral arrangements, educators reviewed textbooks and suggested improvements.

Probably the first international agreement calling for periodic revision of textbooks was one signed by Argentina and Brazil in 1933. Later, in 1935, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation prepared a model international agreement for the revision of textbooks; by the end of 1938, 22 nations had accepted it. The outbreak of war in 1939 temporarily halted these promising efforts.

The end of World War II made it possible to renew multinational efforts on behalf of textbook review and revision. The role of Unesco has proved to be especially important. The program adopted by the Unesco General Conference at its first session in 1946 stated that "Unesco should encourage Member States to make bilateral and regional agreements concerning textbooks." Subsequent Unesco conferences on education gave similar recognition to the importance of textbooks and to the need for their review and revision. For example, the "Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms," adopted by the Unesco General Conference in November, 1974, contained the following recommendations among others:

39. Member States should promote appropriate measures to ensure that educational aids, especially textbooks, are free from elements liable to give rise to misunderstanding, mistrust, racialist reactions, contempt or hatred with regard to other groups or peoples. Materials should provide a broad background of knowledge which will help learners to evaluate information and ideas disseminated through the mass media that seem to run counter to the aims of this recommendation.

45. Member states should encourage wider exchanges of textbooks, especially history and geography textbooks, and should, where appropriate, take measures, by concluding, if possible, bilateral and multilateral agreements, for the reciprocal study and revision of textbooks and other educational materials in order to ensure that they are accurate, balanced, up to date and unprejudiced and will enhance mutual knowledge and understanding between different peoples.

Consistent with these expressions of intent Unesco has encouraged several multi-national and bi-lateral projects directed at improving textbooks. An example of the former is the Major Project for Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values conducted during 1957-64. An example of the latter is the German-Polish Textbook Commission, which began in 1972 and which is sponsored by the Unesco national commissions in the Federal Republic of Germany and the Peoples Republic of Poland, respectively. While Unesco has been important in encouraging textbook studies, much work has been undertaken by nations -- or groups within nations -- acting on their own without Unesco participation. These include a textbook study the USSR has conducted with Finland, a cooperative effort between the United States and Japan, and the project described in this report.

US/USSR Textbook Study Project

The idea for the US/USSR Textbook Study Project may be traced to a visit by the US Assistant Secretary of State John Richardson to the USSR Ministry of Education in May, 1975. During the course of that meeting Assistant Secretary Richardson and members of the Ministry of Education agreed that cooperation between American and Soviet experts for improving textbooks would be desirable. In March, 1976, the Ministry of Education sent a set of Soviet school textbooks to the Department of State together with a proposal calling for a joint textbook study.

The US/USSR Textbook Study Project was formerly authorized by the "Program of Exchanges between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. for 1977-79" signed in Washington, D. C. on October 22, 1976. The "Program of Exchanges. . ." was itself an implementation of the more general understandings contained in "The General Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Contacts, Exchanges, and Cooperation" signed in Washington, D. C. on June 19, 1973 and "The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe." Authority for the textbook study appears under Section I "Education," paragraph 11 of "Program of Exchanges. . .":

> "The parties agree to encourage contacts and the exchange of textbooks and methodological materials between appropriate organizations in the United States and the Soviet Union."

Preparations for the textbook study began with an exchange of delegations during winter, 1977-78. Four Americans spent two weeks

in the USSR in December, 1977, discussing the project with officials in the Ministry of Education, visiting schools and pedagogical institutes, and consulting with historians, geographers, and experts in pedagogy. In February, 1978 three Soviet experts devoted two weeks to travel and study in the United States. They visited schools, universities, government agencies, and publishers in order to exchange views with textbook authors, editors, teachers, and those who make decisions about the adoption of textbooks.

The main purpose of these visits was to seek some common agreement regarding project goals and the procedures to be followed. In order to reach such agreement it was necessary for representatives from each country to become familiar with school curricula, teacher education, and textbook publishing in the other nation.

Following the exchange of visits and consultations the two sides agreed to the following points:

1. <u>The study would focus on history and geography textbooks in the two countries</u>. While the pattern of curriculum organization is not the same in the two nations, school systems in both countries offer courses in history and geography. The grades at which history and geography courses are found are not identical, and the ways in which courses are sequenced and structured internally are dissimilar. Nevertheless, by focusing on these two disciplines, it was possible to draw comparisons between school textbooks written by American and Soviet authors.

2. The study would focus upon the information each textbook contained about the other country and about the relationships between the two countries. There seemed little value in trying to affect how each nation described its own history and geography, or its approach to history and geography broadly. Thus, the American experts focused their attention on the information Soviet textbooks provide about the United States and US-Soviet relations, while Soviet experts concentrated on the information contained in American texts about the Soviet Union and US-Soviet relations.

3. The distribution of individual textbook reviews would be limited to project participants and to the respective authors and publishers of the textbooks. No effort would be made to disseminate broadly the reviews of individual textbooks. The final report, containing the general conclusions and textbook recommendations, would be published in English and in Russian and would be distributed widely in both countries. Limiting the distribution of the reviews of individual textbooks to the respective authors and publishers was largely a concession to the Americans. Since only a sample of the American textbooks could be included in the study, there was no apparent advantage to an American publisher to agree to have his books reviewed unless the textbook critiques were given restricted

circulation. Since publisher cooperation was deemed essential to future willingness to revise textbooks, this seemed to be a small concession. Consistent with this point, it was agreed later that textbooks would not be identified by title, author, or publisher when reporting criticism in the final published report. Particular books would be identified by course or grade level they were intended to serve.

4. Each national team would be free to criticize the textbooks of the other country in whatever way it judged to be most appropriate. Each side would take such criticisms into account when preparing recommendations for the improvement of textbooks in its own country. Thus, the principle was established that the Soviet team would criticize American books and offer recommendations for the improvement of Soviet textbooks. The American team would criticize Soviet textbooks and suggest changes in American textbooks. Chapters II and III of this report contain the results of the American and Soviet textbook reviews; Chapter IV provides recommendations for textbook improvements according to the principle noted here.

PROCEDURES

Following the initial exchange of visits and agreement to the points noted above, the representatives from the two sides organized teams of scholars and educators to conduct the study. Initially, the Ministry of Education proposed that the work be carried out by "national commissions" representing the two nations. This idea, however, did not fit the American situation because of the decentralized nature of American education. The Americans interpreted their role as a private rather than governmental one, operating within the guidelines of a formal bi-lateral agreement but otherwise conducting themselves as a group of individual experts with some responsibility to represent the interests of the four sponsoring American organizations. The Soviet team was established as a 16-member national commission under the sponsorship and support of the USSR Ministry of Education. This asymmetry of organization did not appear to have any negative effect on the conduct of the project.

The American team was sponsored by four professional/trade associations: The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the Association of American Publishers, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Council for the Social Studies. Main financial support on the American side was provided by the International Communication Agency. Additional support was given by the Ford Foundation, the William and Mary Greve Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. By agreement, each side paid its own operating expenses. When international meetings were required,

each side paid its own international air travel; the host side assumed responsibility for all expenses while the visitors were in its own country.

Membership on the two teams changed somewhat during the life of the project. Members of the Soviet Commission were leading historians, geographers, and educators. They included: Academician Aleksei L. Narochnitsky, Commission Chairman and the Director of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences; Ilia B. Berkhin, Vice-President of the Commission and member of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences; Iu. S. Kukushkin, Vice-President of the Commission, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, and a member of the history faculty at Moscow State University; Andrei E. Shirinsky, Vice-President of the Commission and Deputy Head of the Section for International Affairs in the Ministry of Education; Iu. Iu. Ivanov, head of the Section for the Administration of Schools, Ministry of Education; E. A. Ivanyan, historian and member of the Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada, Academy of Sciences; A. B. Koloskov, historian and expert in methods of history teaching in the Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences; V. P. Maksakovsky, head of the Economic Geography Department, Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after Lenin; Zoya A. Mal'kova, director of the Institute for General Pedagogy, Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences; Iu. A. Poliakov, head of the section on the Soviet period in the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences; A. A. Preobrazhensky, head of the section on the history of

feudalism of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences; O. A. Rzheshevsky, head of the section on World War II of the Institute of General History, Academy of Sciences; G. N. Sevastyanov, head of the section on the history of the United States, Institute of General History, Academy of Sciences; G. A. Trukan, head of the section for original source material on the Soviet period, Institute of the History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences; I. A. Fedosov, historian and corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and pro-rector of Moscow State University; and V. K. Furaev, head of the Department of General History, Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute named after Herzen. Besides these people, other Soviet scholars, experts, and authors contributed to the study.

The American team had a project director, an eight-member advisory committee representing the four, sponsoring organizations, and a panel of textbook reviewers. The Project Director was Howard D. Mehlinger, Professor of Education and History and Director of the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University. The members of the advisory committee in 1981 were: Sybil Abbott, Teacher at Clayton Middle School, Reno, Nevada; C. E. Black, Professor of History and Director of the Center for International Studies, Princeton University; Fred Burke, State Superintendent of Public Instruction for New Jersey; Robert Carlson, Associate Director of the Project and Former Director of the National Program for the Advancement of Pre-College Russian and East European Studies; Joseph M. Cronin, Former Superintendent of Education for Illinois;

Charles McDaniel, State Superintendent of Schools for Georgia; Donald W. Robb, Former General Manager for Social Studies and Foreign Languages, Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company; Daniel Taylor, Former Superintendent of Public Instruction for West Virginia.

Nine experts were selected as textbook readers. These were: Charles D. Cary, Independent Researcher and Consultant, Stockton, California; Alexander Dallin, Professor of History and Political Science, Stanford University; George Demko, Professor of Geography, Ohio State University; Peter Dowling, Teacher at Bridgewater-Raritan High School East, Somerville, New Jersey; Jeanne Howard, Assistant Professor of Environmental and Urban Systems, Virginia Polytechnic and State University; William G. Rosenberg, Professor of History, University of Michigan; Robert N. Taaffe, Professor of Geography, Indiana University; John M. Thompson, Associate Director, American Universities Field Staff; Joan Hoff Wilson, Professor of History, Arizona State University. The reviewers represented a mix of talents. Some are among America's leading authorities in Russian and Soviet history, politics, and geography; two are specialists in Soviet education; one is a high school teacher of Russian and Russian history; one is a specialist in American foreign policy. All but one read Russian fluently and were able to review the Soviet textbooks without translation.

In addition to these readers, a number of specialized readers were employed. These people, mainly historians, were experts on

particular topics in American history. Because they did not read Russian, every paragraph in which the United States and/or US-Soviet relations was mentioned in the Soviet textbooks was translated into English. These reviewers wrote extensive critiques of all of the Soviet textbooks.

Selection of Textbooks

Some of the problems that arose in comparing textbooks in the two nations were caused by differences in the structure of the school curriculum. In the United States, courses in history and geography are part of "social studies." The social studies with its inter-disciplinary approach requires that school textbooks in history and geography include some topics not found in Soviet textbooks. Nor is it possible to assert confidently what most American children study in history and Geography. There is no national curriculum in the United States as there is in the Soviet Union. Course offerings vary among states and among communities within a state. Moreover, the pattern of elective courses in American secondary schools, especially high schools, results in students' receiving different kinds of social studies education within the same school. There is a further complication. Years ago American schools adopted a cyclical approach to organizing history courses. This results in United States History ordinarily being taught at three grade levels -- grades 5, 8, and 11 -- with each course covering essentially the same ground. Some students fail to study world history; others study it twice, in grades 7 and 10. The tenth-grade course, in particular,

is expected to treat the history of mankind from the beginning of recorded time to the present and all regions of the earth. This mode of curricular organization has implications for history textbooks as it places severe limits on the amount of space that can be devoted to any single topic. Probably less than half of all American students study geography after the elementary grades. For the most part their opportunities are limited to grade 7 and grade 10; the latter is nearly always an elective course taken by less than half of the students.

In contrast nearly all Soviet students follow the same curriculum in history and geography, despite differences in where they live and their vocational goals. The formal study of history begins in grade 5 and continues each year through grade 10, the final year of secondary school. From grades 8 through 10 Soviet pupils study two history courses each year: one in history of the USSR and one in world history. Soviet students enroll in geography courses every year from grades 5-9. The Soviet history curriculum is organized according to a chronological framework rather than a cyclical one. A designated period of historical time is treated each school year, a period that starts where the preceding grade level stopped and extends to the period where the following grade level will begin. Thus, the tenth-grade world history course in the USSR must deal with only the period 1939 to the present, as contrasted with the American approach.

The curricular differences between the two countries caused some complications in selecting textbooks for the study, because a high school history course in the USSR is not the same as a high school history course in the United States. The decision to focus the reviews on only those portions of history and geography textbooks that contain a treatment of the other nation or on the relationships between the nations narrowed the choices. We decided to include Soviet world history courses for grades 8, 9, and 10; "History of the USSR" for grades 9 and 10; "Geography of the Continents," grade 6; and "Economic Geography of Foreign Countries," grade 9. For the United States, the following courses were included: U.S. history, grades 8 and 11; world history, grade 10; and grades 7 and 10 world geography.

Once this decision was made the selection of textbooks was easy for the Soviet side for there is only one approved text for each course, although each book may be printed in as many as 53 different languages. For the American side the problem was much different and more complex. More than 100 publishers prepare social studies textbooks for school use. In any one year as many as 40 high school American history textbooks are available for school purchase. Clearly, it was not possible to review all of the available textbooks for each of the courses in the study; it was necessary to select a sample.

The American team sent the Ministry of Education a list of all of the textbooks in print for the five courses included in the study

and invited the Ministry to select any book it wanted from the list. At the same time, the Americans tried to gather information regarding which among the American books were most widely adopted by schools. Finally, a list of five, widely used books for each of the five courses was sent to the Ministry. The Ministry accepted this list; the books contributed by the American publishers were sent to the Ministry of Education. (A complete list of American and Soviet books included in the study can be found in Appendix A.)

Project Activities

With the selection and exchange of textbooks, both sides began their review. The first meeting of the entire American team -- advisory committee and reader panel -- took place in June, 1978. The group approved policies for the conduct of the project's work and agreed upon procedures for the textbook reviews. The reviewers were told that they should look for factual errors and problems of bias and distortion resulting from errors of omission, use of emotional language, undue emphasis upon certain details, and so on. While the project was obliged to review the Soviet books only, the American reviewers agreed to examine the American textbooks in the study as well. The American reviewers began work in summer, 1978. Books were allocated so that each was read by at least three reviewers.

In January, 1979 the reviewers met to consider the results of their work and to offer suggestions for a final, composite review of each Soviet textbook to be sent to the Ministry. One result of the

January meeting was the suggestion that the project director seek additional reviews from a group of American historians. He also assumed responsibility for combining all of the various reviews into a single, composite review for each textbook.

In late February and early March, 1979, three members of the American team met with members of the Soviet Textbook Commission to exchange textbook reviews, to discuss the status of the project to date, and to lay plans for a conference of the two delegations scheduled for Moscow in June, 1979. The American representatives delivered their critiques of the Soviet textbooks and reviewed a general essay on major findings gleaned from the reviews of American textbooks. Soviet reviews of each American textbook were sent later by mail.

Representatives of the two sides present conducted an intense but friendly debate on the contents of the history and geography textbooks that had been reviewed. While the exchange was frequently brisk, it was guided throughout by the desire to make the books as factually accurate as possible.

One purpose of the February-March, 1979 meeting was to discuss the structure and agenda for a conference involving all members of the two teams, scheduled for June, 1979 in Moscow. It was agreed that the conference should serve two main purposes: 1) to review the results of the textbook critiques, and 2) to discuss ten important historical and geographical topics that might serve as the basis for future textbook recommendations. These topics were:

American	Soviet
1. The American Revolution and Its Historical Significance	1. The Great October Socialist Revolution and Its Historical Significance
2. Regional Development in the United States	2. Problems of Economic Regions and Regional Development in the USSR
3. War in the Pacific in World War II	3. Eastern Front in World War II
4. American Foreign Policy Toward the USSR in the 1970's	4. Soviet Foreign Policy Toward the United States in the 1970's
5. Contemporary Soviet/Political Development of the United States (1970's)	5. Contemporary Social/Political Development of the USSR (1970's)

The American side agreed to provide brief background papers to the five "American" topics; the Soviet side agreed to prepare background papers to their topics. The intention was to provide papers that might be useful to the other side in preparing recommendations for revisions in textbooks.

The meeting of the two delegations occurred as scheduled during the last two weeks of June, 1979. The first week was devoted primarily to formal sessions involving the two delegations. (See Appendix B for a copy of the conference program.) Most of the time was devoted to the presentation and response to formal papers linked to the ten topics noted above. However, considerable time was given also to the discussion of particular textbook deficiencies and how they might be remedied. Mehlinger and Narotchnitsky, leaders of the two delegations, signed a protocol at the close of the conference that summarized the results of their work. (See Appendix C for a copy

of the protocol.) The second week was devoted to enhancing the American participants' knowledge of the Soviet Union, especially the Soviet educational system. The Americans divided into three groups and visited ministries of education, schools, and universities in Moscow, Leningrad-Kiev, and Tashkent-Samarkand.

The June, 1979 conference contributed importantly to the project's success. It afforded an opportunity for representatives of the two sides to exchange opinions and to offer suggestions for needed textbook improvements. While it was not possible to arrive at any consensus regarding how each of the ten conference topics should be treated in textbooks, much progress was made toward developing better understanding for the various views expressed by textbook authors. Both sides agreed to the project's fundamental importance and pledged to continue their efforts.

During the meetings in June, the two sides also reach agreement on the organization and length of the final report.* It was agreed that the report would appear as a joint report, with specified sections contributed by one side or the other. It was further agreed that the report would be published in both English and in Russian and distributed widely in both countries.

Representatives of the two sides further agreed to hold their next meeting in the United States no later than March, 1980. The

---

*For reasons noted in the Preface, it proved impossible to adhere to the agreement in every detail. However, this report is substantially of the same length and contains the same sections as that projected in June, 1979.

main purpose of the 1980 meeting would be to agree on the text of a final report. They agreed also to exchange preliminary drafts of the final report one month prior to the meeting in the United States.

While preliminary drafts of the final report were exchanged during January and February, 1980, the meeting planned for early in 1980 in the United States did not occur. As a result, the last face-to-face meeting of the project leaders took place in Moscow in June, 1979. All subsequent communication between the two sides was conducted through correspondence.

The June, 1979 meeting in Moscow marked the high point of close collaboration on the project. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December, 1979 and the American response to that invasion interfered with efforts to bring the project to a close as originally planned. Despite efforts on both sides to find a formula that would permit the face-to-face meetings deemed necessary for the preparation of a final report, no solution was found.

For more than one year the project existed in a state of limbo, awaiting some improvement in the political climate. Finally, in spring, 1981 Mehlinger notified Mrs. Zhuravleva of the USSR Ministry of Education that the American team was taking steps to publish its own report based upon the preliminary drafts exchanged more than one year earlier. This report is the result of that initiative.

CHAPTER II -- AMERICAN CRITICISMS OF SOVIET TEXTBOOKS

School textbooks are rarely, if ever, examples of scholarship. More typically, textbook authors depend upon others for facts, generalizations, and theories they include in their textbooks. Nevertheless, the transfer of knowledge from scholarly research to school textbooks is not a simple process. Textbook writing requires many judgments by textbook authors: What is most important for youth to know? What can children of various ages understand? How should information be presented so as to facilitate learning?

The decision of what information children should know is affected by the school's reasons for including the course in its program of study. What historical and geographical facts, generalizations, and theories should be taught are determined largely by why schools believe students should be required to study history and geography.

The purposes for teaching history and geography in Soviet schools are stated in approved syllabi, labeled the Program for Eight-Year Schools and Secondary Schools: History and the Program for Eight-Year Schools and Secondary Schools: Geography.

> -- "The teaching of history is given the task of forming in youth a Marxist-Leninist world-view, deep ideological convictions, a clear, class-oriented approach to phenomena of social life, Soviet patriotism, loyalty

to proletarian internationalism, devotion to the Party's cause, the task of developing a Communist attitude towards work, a feeling of duty and discipline, and irreconcilability to bourgeois ideology." (History, p. 3)

-- "As a result of the study of historic materials these highly important ideas for the world-view of the student are formed:

. the decisive role of the means of production in the life of a society as the basic factor of gradual development of a society.

. the regularity of the changes in socio-economic formations, the inevitability of the victory of Communism which will give an unlimited progressive development to society.

. the class struggle as the driving force for the development of every exploiting society.

. the role of the popular masses as the genuine creators of history and the significance of the individual in history." (History, p. 4)

-- "An examination of the struggle and competition between the two co-existing, opposite social systems ought to be the main axis for the teaching of Noveishaia Istoriia. The task is to explain convincingly to students the basic contents of the modern epoch, using concrete

materials to show them how socialism unswervingly gains strength during the competition of the two systems, how its international influence is growing, and, on the other hand, how the process of the weakening of capitalism and the deepening of its general crisis continue. All of this is proof of the unlimited opportunities of socialism, of its historical superiority over capitalism, that capitalism is a society without a future." (History, p. 16)

-- "Ekonomicheskaia Geografiia Zarubezhnikh Stran (Grade IX) is the final course in the geographic education of the students. The course materials ought to promote the students' conviction about the tremendous advantages of socialism over capitalism, in the unlimited possibilities of socialism, its historic superiority over capitalism." (Geography, p. 15)

The USSR is not unique in its effort to use school courses to extol the virtues of its own society, to promote national patriotism, and to diminish the contributions and advantages of those societies whose ideologies are perceived as hostile to its own. While we do not challenge the right of the Ministry of Education to choose whatever purposes it likes for its history and geography courses, can the goals of objective historical description be satisfied when the purpose of a course is to

promote a particular analysis of society and the superiority of one society over another? The problem of eliminating bias and distortion in textbooks begins with selecting course goals that encourage fair, objective, and even-handed treatment of all people and nations.

One factor that complicates the effort to improve history textbooks is that historians in the two countries embrace two fundamentally different perspectives on the nature of historical inquiry. Most American historians are trained as historicists; they have no shared commitment to a particular set of causal factors. They believe in the uniqueness of historical events and often disagree about why certain events occurred and about the meaning and significance of these events. Moreover, historical writing in the United States is a form of social criticism to a greater degree than in the USSR.

In contrast, Soviet historians are guided by a Marxist-Leninist philosophy of history. They seek to place particular events in the context of general historical processes. They focus on selected factors that contribute to historical development and explain events in terms of these factors. Class struggle and the ownership of the means of production are two important concepts that affect the writing of history in the USSR. While American historians recognize economic factors in historical analysis, they tend to give equal weight to such factors as religion, family, ethnicity, and individual ego:

factors that Soviet historians either ignore or incorporate into their economic analyses of society. Of course, in scholarly monographs some Soviet scholars devote attention to a variety of causal factors, but this complexity is not reflected in Soviet school textbooks.

The tendency in Soviet scholarship to focus on broad social forces rather than unique events contributes to another difference between American and Soviet textbooks: the treatment accorded to the contribution of individuals to history. With the exception of the attention devoted to Lenin -- his ideas, words, and deeds -- there is a tendency in Soviet textbooks to play down the influence of individuals in history and to focus instead upon the combined impact of individuals acting as members of a group: capitalists, workers, bourgeoisie, peasants, etc. Thus, American and Soviet accounts both of the American Revolution and the October Socialist Revolution differ in part because American descriptions highlight the roles played by individuals while the emphasis in Soviet treatments is on the importance of mass movements. In Soviet textbooks individuals are presented as representatives of classes; their behavior is explained not in terms of who they are as unique persons but as spokesmen for particular class interests. While recognizing the importance of interest groups, most American historians do not depend upon the concept of social class as the principal mode of historical explanation. They emphasize the roles of individuals as unique actors, affected undoubtedly

by their social class but frequently deviating in interesting and important ways from others who share their social class membership.

No one expects this project to cause either country to alter its basic approach to the study of history and geography or to adopt entirely new goals for history and geography instruction in the schools. Nevertheless, efforts to improve textbooks in order to promote better mutual understanding in the interest of international peace and security must take these factors into account.

SOME GENERAL PROBLEMS INVOLVING THE ANALYSES OF HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY TEXTBOOKS

The American reviewers of Soviet history and geography textbooks identified a series of general problems relating to textbook improvement. The types of problems discussed below were characteristic of all of the texts and are not limited to one or two. The examples given for each problem are cited merely as illustrations. They do not exhaust the number of cases uncovered by the reviewers.

Problem of Ideological Bias

The foremost problem is that of ideological bias because to one degree or another all of the remaining classes of problems -- adequate coverage, balance of treatment, factual errors, and so on -- are affected by it. The need to make

history and geography fit a preordained, analytical framework guides the choice of topic, the selection of evidence, and the decision about how events are to be interpreted. The problem of ideological bias is important also because it will be the most difficult to resolve. Yet inability to achieve satisfaction in this domain will affect our success in resolving the other classes of problems.

Marxism-Leninism has contributed fresh and powerful analyses of social processes. However, undue reliance upon these tools of analysis can lead to warped interpretations when events are forced to fit predetermined frames of reference. For example, "dispossession of their land" was the principal factor forcing Englishmen to migrate to the American colonies, according to the grade-eight Soviet world history textbook. While the enclosure system surely played some part, equally if not more important, were the desires of many to exercise religious freedom, and of others for adventure and to profit from mercantilist nationalism. In the same book the author asserts, "Thus, during the revolutionary war, in the course of a bitter class struggle, power in the USA went from one class to another -- from the land-owning aristocrats to the industrial-trading bourgeoisie of the North, who ruled in union with the plantation slave-owners of the South." Research does not support the thesis that the American Revolution was fought across social class lines. Some large landowners were loyalists; but a great

number, including Washington and Jefferson, were patriots. Moreover, while the "industrial-trading bourgeoisie" was important in 1776, it could not have played the role assigned it by the Soviet author.

Many more examples could be cited, but this problem is no more pronounced in the grade eight history book than in others. The point is that the ideological perspective incorporated by the Soviet textbook authors illuminates some factors while badly neglecting or distorting others. The net result is to provide a less than fully accurate account of important events.

Problem of Adequate Coverage

In general Soviet textbooks provide an appropriate number of pages to a discussion of the United States and US/Soviet relations. Indeed, it is probably true that Soviet youth will acquire more information about the United States from their history and geography textbooks than typical American students will learn about the USSR from their study of history and geography (given that the majority are unlikely to study geography in high school and for many, American history will be their only history course). Soviet youth learn about important events and topics of American history: founding of the original colonies, the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution, the Constitution, the westward movement, the Civil War, Reconstruction and industrialization, World War I, the Great Depression, World War II, and major post World War II

events. In geography students learn about important physical and economic regions of the United States, its natural resources, and the growth of urbanization.

Despite this generally positive appraisal there are important oversights in the topical treatment of the United States. For example, little appears about the importance of religion in American thought; the role of political parties is given scant attention; reform movements such as Jacksonian democracy, populism, and the Progressive Movement are either ignored totally or mentioned only slightly despite their significance. Nor are Soviet youth capable of learning very much from their textbooks about how typical Americans live: about their family life, schools, churches, recreation, work, and other elements of daily existence.

Relationships between the United States and the USSR (until 1917 Russia) span more than 200 years. Some reference is made to these associations, but important opportunities are missed. Too little is said about the early Russian settlements in the Western United States, about the migration of vast numbers of Russians and other peoples of the Russian Empire to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, about contacts between the two societies through trade and culture, about food relief to the USSR shortly after World War I, and about the effort of Theodore Roosevelt to bring the Russo-Japanese War to a satisfactory conclusion in 1905. The pages devoted to

relationships between the United States and the USSR tend to dwell on negative experiences rather than more positive ones.

Problem of Balance of Treatment

One question is whether the amount of treatment accorded the United States is adequate, given the purpose and scope of a textbook; a second question is whether the treatment provided is balanced or fair. In general, the reviewers found much to criticize.

Attention is focused on the least attractive aspects of American life: poverty, unemployment, inflation, crime, social inequality, racism, hedonism, and militarism. No one would deny that American society and culture contain elements of all of these, but few Americans understand these to be the dominant features of American life. But what will Soviet students conclude from their tenth-grade world history book that asserts: "It is not surprising that a typical trait of American society, which is founded on social inequality, should be violence and terror"? Or what impression will Soviet students gain of the American standard of living from their ninth-grade geography book that states: "Under the conditions of Capitalism one-third of Americans are unable to buy necessary food"?

Textbooks that provide one-sided and slanted accounts of another society leave distorted images in the minds of impressionable youth. We do not object to Soviet textbooks' presenting

descriptions of social problems that concern many Americans, but some balance is required and the authors should also discuss some of the many public and private programs that have been established to resolve such problems. Nor is it fair to imply that poverty, assault, theft, alcoholism, and racism are found in capitalist societies only. What is required are textbook descriptions of both the strengths and the weaknesses of a society, together with a discussion of how and whether a country is seeking to resolve its social problems.

Problem of Inappropriate Terms

Soviet textbooks frequently employ terms that convey impressions to students that may distort reality, interfere with clear thinking, and promote bias and prejudice. Some terms, originally intended to encourage precision in analysis, have acquired emotional overtones. The use of such labels may provoke emotional reactions rather than calm reflection.

Imperialism is such a term. Imperialism was first used to indicate the effort by one nation or group of people to extend political control over another. Subsequently, Lenin used the term to explain why workers in advanced industrialized nations had failed to overthrow capitalism by the beginning of the twentieth century. Lenin described imperialism as a new, higher, and final form of capitalism, in which advanced nations exploited poor nations, leading to a new kind of class struggle.

The term imperialist is used by Soviet authors to describe a great number of nations that may be comparable in terms of their economic development but are quite different in other ways. For example, Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Imperial Japan, Great Britain, France, and the United States are all termed "imperialist nations" and their policies prior to 1939 are described as being very similar. While the first three nations are also described as more aggressive, according to Soviet authors, the goal of all of the "imperialist nations" was the same -- the destruction of the USSR. Linking the United States with Nazi Germany -- as well as Fascist Italy and Imperial Japan -- is not very helpful in the effort to improve relations between our two countries. Students are told in their grade 10 world history that "After the war [World War II] the USA emerged as the main economic and military-political force of imperialism" and that "American imperialism became the world's largest exploiter." Needless to say, the American team objects to this description. Moreover, given the original meaning of the term imperialism, it is difficult to avoid using it to apply to any nation that seeks to extend political control over another, whether its dominant economic form is socialist or capitalist.

"State monopolistic capitalism" is another term that is used to describe the United States. To their credit, Soviet scholars understand the growing importance of the public sector in the American economy and the role of government as a regulator

of economic activity. Nevertheless, Soviet scholars interpret the key feature of American economy to be the constant urge for monopoly on the part of major corporations and the assistance by government to make this possible. This perspective does not permit a discussion of the way that government functions so as to encourage competition, to help small businesses, to support farmers, and to protect consumers. No one can deny the political and economic power at the disposal of large banks and corporations. Nevertheless, few if any American scholars find the term "state monopolistic capitalism" sufficient to describe the main characteristics of the American economy.

Problem of Factual Errors

A factual error is defined as using incorrect data: providing the wrong date for an event, including people in an event who were not present, placing the event in the wrong location. Every textbook inevitably contains some errors, but Soviet textbooks are remarkably free of factual errors. They are apparently written and edited carefully.

Nevertheless, the American reviewers did find some important factual errors and have pointed these out to the Soviet Textbook Commission. For example, the world history book for grade 10 asserts: "Seeking to halt the building of socialism in the northern part of the country and suppress the national liberation struggle in the South, the South Korean puppets started a war

against the P.D.R.K. in June, 1950 with the aid of American imperialism." This passage could be challenged on several grounds, including the use of the emotive term "puppets." However, it is most seriously deficient because it contains an important factual error. The Korean War began on June 25, 1950 when soldiers of North Korea attacked the South, not the reverse as Soviet students are taught.

We recognize that this factual error is not an oversight by the author and editor. Soviet scholars support the author and deny our claim that the passage is incorrect.

Another type of factual error is one in which more is claimed than the available evidence supports. For example, the following passage about John Wilkes Booth, the assassin of Abraham Lincoln, appears in the grade-eight world history text: "On April 14, five days after the surrender of Lee, during an official performance in Washington, the loyal son of the American people, Lincoln, was murdered. He was killed by an actor who was a hireling of the slave-holding South, and it is suspected, of the large Northern capitalists." The date, place, and event are correct. However, there is no proof that Booth was employed by either the "slave-holding South" or "large Northern capitalists."

Problems of Distortion and Bias by Undue Emphasis upon Particular Information

More serious than factual errors are the bias and distortion that appear in Soviet textbooks because of undue and excessive

emphasis upon a particular fact, statement, or event taken out of context and given more significance than it deserves. The problem of which evidence to select is a recurring one for all historians, but we found this problem to be among the most serious deficiencies in Soviet textbooks.

An example of this problem can be found in the grade-eight world history textbook. Commenting on the attitude of white settlers toward American Indians, the author writes: "The American bourgeoisie and the slave-owners tried to seize as much foreign land as possible. First of all they began with the extermination of the Indians, in order to seize their lands. 'The only good Indian is a dead Indian,' said American generals. One means of exterminating the Indians was the following: Blankets were strewn about near an Indian settlement. The Indians, not suspecting anything, gathered them up and covered themselves with them. Then they began to die in masses from smallpox -- it turned out that the Americans had wrapped up those who were sick with or had died from smallpox beforehand in the blankets. Thus, by the 19th century the American military was already using methods of monstrous bacteriological warfare."

No one would deny that the Indians were often exploited and mistreated, and it <u>may</u> be true that smallpox infected blankets were once used to decimate Indians, although American historians are not agreed that this was ever done. But, even if it did occur, it does not justify the far-fetched conclusion that this was a

result of a conscious policy to conduct bacteriological warfare on the part of the American military, a policy the author asserts continues to the present time. No purpose can be served by such a statement other than to poison the attitudes of Soviet youth toward the United States.

Soviet Characterization of US as a War Time Ally. Soviet textbooks present the United States as a deceitful ally throughout World War II. Soviet students learn that Soviet goals during the war were "the destruction of fascism, the liberation of enslaved peoples, and the restoration of democratic freedoms -- the creation of conditions for a lasting peace," while the USA and England were mainly concerned about "the destruction of Germany and Japan as fundamental competitors and the confirmation of their own world domination." Soviet students are told that the United States and England deliberately delayed opening up a second front in Western Europe, despite "huge armed forces and a powerful military industrial basis," in order to let German and Soviet troops destroy each other. Soviet students are told that the United States suspended shipments of war materials to northern parts of the USSR for eight months in spring, 1943, not mentioning that this was the period of most severe German air attacks on lend-lease convoys from German air bases in Norway. One textbook, seeking to show treachery on the part of American government officials, used a quotation from Senator (later President) Harry Truman, uttered in 1941 between the attack by Germany on the USSR and the

Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, in which he expressed the hope that the Germans and Russians would exhaust themselves in military struggle. We don't doubt that Senator Truman made such a statement at that time. Many Americans were deeply distressed by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the dismemberment of Poland, and Soviet reluctance to take a stand while German armies overran Western Europe. But once the United States was drawn into the war, most Americans accepted the Soviet Union fully as an ally. To use a statement by Truman before the attack on Pearl Harbor as indicative of his wartime attitude as well as that of other Americans during the war is wholly misleading.

The consequence of selecting bits and pieces of evidence such as the above and giving them more attention than they deserve is to obscure the truth. It is not that the facts stated are incorrect. It is the selection of facts and the emphasis given to particular pieces of information that leave a distorted impression.

Problem of Omission of Important Details

Bias and distortion can also be introduced into an otherwise accurate account by leaving out an important detail. In the example cited earlier, it is difficult for Soviet students to understand why lend-lease shipments were interrupted in 1943 if they are not told about the successful air raids and submarine attacks on American shipping during this period.

An especially glaring example of distortion by omission appears in Soviet textbook accounts of what Americans term the "Cuban Missile Crisis." In the tenth-grade world history book the following passage appears:

> "In October, 1962, the American imperialists declared a military blockade of Cuba and prepared for an invasion of the Island of Liberty. The USA had created in the vicinity of the Caribbean Sea a crisis which pushed the world to the brink of thermonuclear war. Thanks only to the hard line and decisive measures of the Soviet Union, a military conflict was avoided on the basis of a Soviet-American agreement between the two governments. The US government pledged before the whole world not to attack Cuba and to restrain its allies in the Western Hemisphere from doing so.
>
> "However, the USA did organize a blockade of Cuba, which caused economic difficulties in the country."

The problem with this account is what is not included. There is no mention of the fact that the USSR had placed offensive missiles in Cuba that threatened the security of the United States. The existence of intermediate range ballistic missiles, more than any other factor, precipitated the "crisis which pushed the world to the brink of thermonuclear war." It is true that the United States did pledge it would not attack Cuba, but the USSR also pledged that it would withdraw its missiles and refrain from

placing offensive weapons in Cuba in the future. The Soviet part of the agreement is missing from the account. The consequence is that Soviet students are led to conclude that American desire to intimidate Cuba nearly prompted World War III, whereas it was the Soviet attempt to use Cuba as an offensive base against the United States that nearly led to war.

Problem of Dependence upon Out-of-Date Information

A problem all textbook authors face is that of staying abreast with most recent information. In some cases the use of out-of-date information by Soviet authors is so serious that Soviet students are left with a very distorted picture about life in the United States.

Nowhere is this problem more evident than in discussion of current racial conditions in America and the treatment accorded to black people. The following account appears in the sixth-grade Soviet geography textbook:

> "Negroes live primarily in the South of the U.S.A. and islands of the Caribbean Sea. Although according to the laws of the U.S.A., Negroes are regarded as equal, in reality they are without rights. Negroes work on plantations as tenant farmers or they rent land for a share of the harvest. In the cities they perform primarily heavy or dirty work, ("Black work for the Blacks -- so say White racists"). For one and the same labor, Negroes receive

less pay than Whites. Negro children are not allowed in White schools nor on streetcars and buses and in restaurants and cafes it is often possible to see the shameful sign "White only." In the cities, special blocks are designated for Negroes which lack elementary sanitary conditions and conveniences."

This paragraph would be substantially true if it had been written about the United States of the 1930's and even into the 1950's. But the account is intended to describe the situation as it exists today. Americans cannot be proud of the way its black citizens have been treated throughout most of American history, but neither can we be satisfied that Soviet textbooks fail to record the substantial progress that has occurred in the United States during the past 25 years. These changes combine to make most of the statements contained in the paragraph above out-of-date and no longer accurate.

There is another kind of issue that fits under the category of out-of-date information. On the one hand Soviet schools should be congratulated for introducing Soviet youth to such American authors as Theodore Dreiser, Ernest Hemingway, Upton Sinclair, William Faulkner, Mark Twain, and Jack London. Yet dependence upon these authors for descriptions of the United States today can contribute to distorted impressions. It is also necessary for Soviet youth to have opportunities to read books by current, leading American authors if they are to appreciate American

society and culture today.

SOME TOPICS DESERVING IMPROVED TREATMENT IN SOVIET HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

The preceding section of this chapter was devoted to certain classes of problems the American reviewers encountered as they read Soviet textbooks: e.g., ideological bias, factual errors, omission of detail, out-of-date information. Examples of each problem were included as illustrations.

But it is important to go beyond the mere listing and description of problem categories. It is also necessary to identify particular deficiencies in the treatment of major historical and geographical topics, events, and processes. This section focuses on American history and geography topics that are presented imperfectly in current Soviet textbooks. Available space does not permit us to discuss all of the topics that concern us; the following ones are among the most significant. Our suggestions should be helpful in planning future revisions of Soviet textbooks.

The American Revolution

Soviet youth study the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the United States Constitution in their grade-eight world history textbook. In general, the amount of space devoted to these topics seems reasonable and adequate given the author's responsibility to provide coverage for world-

wide events over a period ranging from 1640-1870. Nevertheless, we believe certain improvements could be made in the presentation of these topics.

The current textbook treatment of the period leading up to the American Revolution tends to blur what was the most important issue for the colonists: taxation without representation. Following the Seven Years War, Britain was faced with a mountainous debt. George Grenville, the British prime minister, thought that the colonies should share in the responsibility for alleviating this debt. As a result, Parliament passed two laws, the Sugar Act of 1764 and the Stamp Act of 1765. The Sugar Act levied a tax on foreign molasses imported into the American colonies, and the Stamp Act required the Americans to use stamped paper for a great variety of public and private documents.

The Americans reacted negatively to these acts because they saw them as changing their customary relationship with the British empire and because they believed that these laws threatened basic rights possessed by every Englishman. While the colonial legislators had long taxed the colonists for revenue purposes, Parliament had not done so previously. The colonists believed that Parliament had no constitutional right to begin to do so. The vehemence with which the colonists asserted their rights ultimately came to be interpreted by the British as a challenge to the sovereignty of the Parliament over the colonies. Later, Parliament revised the Sugar Act and repealed the Stamp Act but only after passing the

Declaratory Act which confirmed the power of Parliament over the colonies "in all cases whatsoever." The crisis came to an end, but the issue remained.

Subsequently, the British were to legislate new taxes. Americans, feeling that their liberty was being threatened, became increasingly alienated and ever more unruly in resisting the efforts of the British to control them. One result was the Boston Massacre of March 5, 1770.

The Soviet textbook fails to make clear that all of the colonists were affected by the actions of Parliament; the impact of the tax laws was not restricted to a single social class. It is true that not all colonists reacted in the same way to the burden. A large number -- perhaps as many as one-third of the population -- remained loyal to the British government; but loyalists and patriots were drawn from all levels of social strata. The author errs when he asserts, "Rich landowners, a part of the slave owners, and the royal officials were opposed to the colonists who were struggling for independence." Surely that is true of some, but not all. Jefferson and Washington are among the best known landowners and slave owners who were in the forefront of the colonial revolt. On the other hand, some non-property holders remained loyal to the crown.

The American Revolution is best characterized as a "war of independence," a struggle by the colonists to secure their political freedom from what they had come to perceive as

arbitrary and oppressive authority. It was not a social revolution as was the French Revolution that followed shortly in its wake. The American Revolution did not contain a "bitter class struggle" nor was power transferred from "one class to another," as the author asserts. Such an interpretation is mistaken and prevents Soviet students from fully appreciating the true significance of the American Revolution.

Declaration of Independence

For the most part the author's treatment of the Declaration of Independence is both succinct and accurate. Nevertheless, the Declaration of Independence did not occur as a result of "pressure from the masses," as the author asserts. A group of Americans, organized to bring about separation from England, deserve special recognition. Nor is it clear how the bourgeoisie "used the advanced ideas of the 'Declaration' to fortify the power of the owning classes. . ." It is true, as the author notes, that the Declaration of Independence did not itself end slavery, halt the violence toward Indians, or provide equal political rights to women and non-property holders. But the Declaration of Independence was constantly "used" in subsequent years by various reformers, including abolitionists and suffragettes, to fight injustice.

The United States Constitution

What is included about the U.S. Constitution in the Soviet grade-eight textbook is factually accurate but insufficient to

provide Soviet students with an adequate understanding of American government. Additional material should be added.

Four important features of American government might be emphasized at this point in the text. (1) The United States has a constitutional government. This means that public officials ultimately receive their authority to make, implement, and enforce their decisions from a written constitution. They may not legally assume responsibilities beyond the authority either stated or implied by the Constitution. (2) The United States has a democratic-republican form of government. The American government is "democratic" in that ultimate decision-making power rests with the people. By their votes Americans can change policies by changing political leaders. It is a "republican" form of government because most policy decisions are made by representatives not by the citizens themselves. (3) The United States has a federal system of government. A federal system is one that has a division of powers between the central government and its chief subdivisions -- in our country the fifty states. The United States is a federation of states with a strong central government. Both the states and the national government get their authority from the people by means of the Constitution. Neither the state governments nor the national government are dependent upon the other for their power, and local governments gain their authority from the state rather than from the national government. The Constitution clearly assigns some duties to the national

government only (for example, coining money); other powers are reserved to the states (for example, establishing local governments); while still other powers are shared by the national and state governments (for example, ability to tax). (4) Power is separated among three branches of government. These three branches check and balance one another. The Constitution provides for a separation of powers at the national level among three major branches of government: the executive, legislative, and judicial. These branches are separated partly because each has a different function. The Congress passes laws; the President mainly administers laws; and the Supreme Court decides disputes growing out of law. Yet the Constitution did not provide for absolute separation of the law-making, executive and judicial powers. Each branch has some power to check the other two. This tends to create a rough balance of political power among the three branches ensuring that none can easily gain power over the others.

If these points were added to the present textbook treatment of the U.S. Constitution, we are certain that Soviet students would gain a better understanding of the American political system. Finally, we wish to point to certain deficiencies in the current textbook treatment of the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution, known world-wide as the Bill of Rights. A mere listing of some of the individual freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution is insufficient for Soviet students to grasp their significance

for political life in the United States. Nor do we agree with the author's conclusion: "These 'freedoms' exist today on paper but are constantly violated." The impression this statement will leave with Soviet students is that the Bill of Rights has no real meaning in the United States and that these freedoms are neither guaranteed nor taken seriously. That the freedoms are sometimes violated cannot be denied, but such violations are the exception and not the rule. Moreover, when violations occur, they can be corrected by the courts.

American Indians

American Indians are discussed briefly in the Soviet eighth-grade world history textbook but primarily as objects of exploitation by white settlers. We do not deny that Indians were often treated cruelly, but we do not understand why the American Indians are mentioned only in this way. What is the author's purpose?

In Soviet textbooks American Indians lack identity -- even humanity. There is no discussion of their culture or the differences among the various Indian groups; no Indian leaders are mentioned; nor can students learn about ways Indians sometimes formed federations to resist fiercely white encroachment on their land; nor is it ever mentioned that whites and Indians sometimes lived peacefully with one another. In short, all a student can learn about American Indians from Soviet textbooks is that they were sorely mistreated. Such a presentation is unfair --

especially to the Indians themselves.

The explanations offered regarding why the Indians were exploited are also simplistic and inadequate. The impression is left that the policy toward Indians was the result of religious zeal and individual greed. In reality, the problem was much deeper than this. The confrontation between the Indians and the Europeans was prompted by a clash of cultures. Neither Indians nor whites were capable of understanding the culture of the other or making allowances for the differences. The white settlers wanted to treat the Indians as nations, to buy their land, and to conduct affairs in ways familiar to the. But concepts of nationhood and landownership were largely foreign to the Indian culture. The inability of each group to rise above its culture led to severe conflicts. Because the white settlers were better organized and better armed than the Indians, they were able ultimately to vanquish them and to treat them as conquered people. More sophistication in the Soviet textbook treatment of this topic would be helpful.

Political Parties

Soviet students acquire a highly unbalanced, prejudicial, and biased understanding of American political parties from their textbooks. It is impossible for them to gain an accurate perception of the function of political parties in the American system of government, their methods of operation, and their

programs. It is fair to include instances of corruption as part of the treatment of American political parties; even American textbooks do not ignore such cases. But to make corruption of politicians the focus of an examination of political parties, as does the ninth-grade world history textbook, is to mislead Soviet students about the true nature of political parties and an important aspect of political life in the United States.

The author of the ninth-grade text is largely correct in arguing that no significant differences distinguished the Republican and Democratic parties in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Where he is wrong is in assuming that they both represented the intests of "monopolistic capitalists." The reason for lack of difference is that unlike parties of Western Europe, they were (and are) both non-ideological. They contained within them a wide and often contradictory range of interests and constituencies. The Republican party of Mark Hanna was also the party of Robert LaFollette. The Democratic party of Tom Watson, a southern Democrat who hated immigrants as well as black people, was also the party of urban "political machine" leaders who spoke for the immigrants and often were immigrants themselves. In failing to understand this diversity, the author distorts the complexity and variety of American politics in the "gilded age" and now. He is also trapped into making many figures who were opponents of the business community -- people such as LaFollette and Watson -- into their champions.

It would be foolish to deny the influence that large corporations and wealthy individuals exert on political parties. It is equally preposterous to ignore the power possessed by other groups, such as organized labor, farmers, and various interest coalitions such as those concerned with civil rights and environmental protection. Moreover, parties with the same political title often act differently at local, state, and national levels of government. In sum, the present textbook treatment is too narrow and simplistic in its treatment, contributing more misperception than useful knowledge.

Civil War

The author of the grade eight world history book devotes an appropriate amount of space to one of the most significant events in American history. It is important that Soviet students understand the Civil War because it had substantial consequences for the later development of the United States.

However, we are not satisfied with the account that appears in the Soviet textbook. For example, the textbook states that "the main reason for the Civil War was the conflict between two systems of production -- the system of slavery and the system of hired labor -- and the struggle for power between the slaveholders and the bourgeoisie who were supported by the popular masses of the North." According to the author, the Civil War was "a bitter class struggle, a bourgeoisie revolution, during which the country

was divided into two warring parts." This is an incorrect interpretation.

The central issue for most Americans on the eve of the Civil War was whether slavery would be permitted to expand into newly acquired territories. It was mainly a question of political power. If slavery were excluded from the new territories, then the political power of the Northern states would likely grow at the expense of the South. There were many Americans who opposed slavery on moral and religious grounds, including abolitionists such as John Brown. But even Lincoln was not prepared initially to abolish slavery where it already existed in 1861, whatever his own personal views might have been. Indeed, his decision to issue the Emanicipation Proclamation was prompted not only by humanitarian concerns but also by the presumed disruptive effects it would have on the Southern war effort. The Southern states seceded primarily because they saw little future within the Union if it were not possible to extend their culture to new territories. The act of secession forced Lincoln to pursue a war he hoped to avoid.

Much of the discussion of the conduct of the war seems intended more to promote its historical links with Soviet students than to elucidate important individuals and events. For example, the author takes note of two rather inconspicuous army commanders, "the German Communist, Weidemeier" and "Ivan Turchaninov from St. Petersburg" but fails to mention Robert E. Lee or Ulysses S.

Grant -- or other prominent Northern and Southern military leaders. The author also states that "the workers organized special troops and regiments according to their trade (printers, construction workers)" and that "the worker troops were the best troops and were victorious on the front lines." While soldiers did organize themselves on the basis of ethnic groups, we know of very few instances in which they organized on the basis of crafts or trades. Consequently, there is no evidence that shows these worker troops performed better than regular troops.

American Economic System

Soviet textbooks devote considerable space to the American economic system. This is hardly surprising because at the core of the rivalry between the United States and the USSR are fundamentally different beliefs about the optimum way to organize economic activity. Soviet textbooks characterize the United States as the world's leading capitalist state and the USSR the leading socialist one. Textbook explanations of the American economy are aimed at helping students understand the strengths and weaknesses of the American economy from a Soviet perspective.

The Soviet textbooks are best when discussing the economic history of the United States during the late nineteenth century, a period of rapid industrialization, of the growth of large corporations, and of the creation of trusts. They emphasize that a relatively small number of people gained enormous wealth and

political power during this period. They comment on the negative effects of the Industrial Revolution on worker lives and the problems workers faced in organizing unions to protect their interests. Much less is written about farmers, although during this period more Americans lived in rural areas than in urban, and until 1890 the monetary value of American agricultural production exceeded that of industry.

Another group ignored by the Soviet textbook for this period is the American middle class. Their omission is all the more serious because their importance in American life represents one of the essential differences between the United States and Russia in the decades preceding the October 17 Revolution (and one of the reasons commonly cited why the United States has not developed a Marxist tradition). Not only was the middle class numerous, it played probably the leading role in most of the social movements of the era: Progressivism, muckraking, compulsory education, change in women's status, etc. Thus, one cannot properly discuss authors like Twain, Sinclair, and Dreiser without noting from which groups they came or for whom they wrote. Upton Sinclair, for example, might have been trying to convert people to socialism when he wrote The Jungle, but what he accomplished was to so disturb his middle class readers that they promptly legislated the Pure Food and Drug Act.

Throughout Soviet textbooks American workers are characterized as "ideologically immature" or thwarted by reactionary union

leaders. What Soviet students are unable to learn from their textbooks is that the situation for workers was different in the United States than in Europe. Class barriers were not so severe in the United States as they had been in the countries from which the workers came. Certainly, life could be harsh for a poor immigrant worker, who spoke little or no English upon arrival in America, but it was possible to change his social status within his own lifetime. With the exception of black people, America was a "land of opportunity." Surely Horatio Alger stories were exaggerated and highly romanticized, but none-the-less they expressed rather well the ideals of the time. And whatever the realities may have been, there was greater opportunity for social mobility in the United States than in any other country at this time.

Nor are Soviet textbooks very good at explaining the changes that have occurred in U.S. economic life since the presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Students learn from their textbooks that the influence of government in the economy has increased, but primarily in the direction of protecting the interests of capitalists. Little is mentioned about Federal regulation for the purpose of consumer protection, promotion of organized labor through the Wagner Act, government welfare support, unemployment compensation, medical care, retirement insurance, guaranteed prices for farm products, and a host of other devices to ensure that an economic system that continues to value individual initiative and enter-

prise does not act ruthlessly toward those who for one reason or another are not able to take advantage of the freedom it affords.

Whatever its shortcomings, the American economy continues to support the highest paid labor force in the world while producing a seemingly endless amount of goods and services. Moreover, the barriers that once prevented black people from participating fully and equally in the opportunities available to others have been mainly bridged. Soviet youth should be taught these aspects of the American economy together with other ideas they presently receive.

World War II

World War II is an important event in world history. For Soviet citizens it was a period of enormous hardship and heroism. They can be justifiably proud of the courage displayed by the Soviet people who first resisted, then expelled the Nazi invaders. It is quite understandable that the history of World War II continues to have a prominent place in Soviet schools; it is equally understandable why Soviet textbooks give special emphasis to the role played by the USSR in the successful prosecution of that war.

Nevertheless, without in any way diminishing the Soviet contribution, we were disappointed by what Soviet students learn about the United States' effort in World War II, especially by statements relating to American motives in prosecuting the war

and its attitudes toward its wartime ally. In our opinion, the discussion of World War II should not be used as an occasion to create mistrust of the United States. Four topics seem particularly important: events preceding the Nazi invasion of the USSR, the question of a second front, the war in Asia, and the use of atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Events Preceding the Nazi Invasion of the USSR. The Soviet tenth-grade world history textbook contains the following charge: "The ruling circles of England, France, and the U.S.A. encouraged the aggressors [Germany, Italy, and Japan] to attack the USSR, counting on the mutual destruction of both sides in such a war and on the strengthening of their own position in the post-war world." This cynical view of American policy is false. While this may have been the attitude of some Americans, this was not the feeling of the majority or the policy of the government. Official American policy during the 1930's was "isolationism," a desire to avoid becoming a participant in any European or Asian squabble. This policy may have had the unintended effect of encouraging aggressive behavior on the part of Germany, Italy, and Japan; but that was not its purpose.

With the German attack on Poland and later on the nations of Western Europe, public opinon began to shift. Increasingly, Americans realized that Nazi appetite was insatiable and that German success would produce a world tragedy. Still, Roosevelt had to move cautiously with plans to aid England. While Americans

were beginning psychologically to choose sides, they were unwilling to become combatants.

The Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, the dismemberment of Poland, and the Soviet war with Finland poisoned American attitudes toward the USSR. (Even the American Communist Party experienced a severe drop in membership at this time.) Many Americans concluded that Stalin had cynically struck a bargain with Hitler that enabled the latter to conquer Western Europe while Stalin was free to settle territorial claims on the borders of the USSR. Undoubtedly, some Americans gained satisfaction when the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact collapsed. But whatever attitudes most Americans may have held prior to June, 1941 changed quickly when the United States became a full partner in the war against the Axis powers in December, 1941. Previous suspicion and mistrust were set aside for the pursuit of military victory.

Question of a Second Front. The author of the tenth-grade world history textbook has this to say about the opening of a second front:

> "In the course of the Soviet-English and Soviet-American negotiations an understanding was reached about the opening of a 'second front' in Europe in 1942. The USA and England possessed huge armed forces and a powerful military-industrial basis for conducting military operations in Europe, especially as approximately 70 percent of the German army was concentrated on the Eastern Front. However, Western powers deliberately

deceived their ally. They preferred to wait and see how the course of events turned out, wagering on the attrition of forces of the warring countries.

"Delaying the opening of the second front postponed the routing of fascism and doomed still more millions of people to death. In the course of three years the Soviet Union literally fought a one-on-one heroic battle with Hitler's hordes, thereby saving world civilization from fascist barbarism."

One can be sympathetic to the plight of the Soviet people and its army. They did, indeed, face the full brunt of Nazi armor. But the assertion that the delay in opening a second front was intended to encourage attrition on both sides is false. The United States was not mobilized for war at the time of Pearl Harbor -- and it took a full two years, until early 1944, for American industry to be geared for military production. The United States and Britain never made an iron-clad pledge to open a second front in Europe in 1942 -- or in 1943, for that matter. American leaders wanted to make a cross-Channel thrust against Hitler's Fortress Europe in 1942 or 1943, but the British refused to consider such an invasion until the North Atlantic supply route was clear of German submarines and American industry was fully engaged in military production.

Meanwhile, allied air forces based in England began to conduct regular raids on German industrial centers. And in autumn 1942

British and American forces invaded North Africa. While we agree that the invasion of North Africa was not equivalent to what an invasion of France might have been, neither do we accept the assessment of the North African campaign contained in the tenth-grade textbook: "By undertaking an invasion of the French colonies [in North Africa], the USA and England were pursuing their own imperialistic interests. Each of these countries sought to fortify its own position there."

War in Asia. Soviet students would have a somewhat greater appreciation of the American war effort if they understood that the United States was fighting a war on two fronts from December, 1941 to May, 1945. Soviet textbooks contain very little about the war in the Pacific, beyond a discussion of the Pearl Harbor attack and a description of the entry of the USSR into war against Japan in August, 1945. But just as the Soviet people had to carry the main burden for the defeat of the Nazis from 1941 to 1944, so the American army and navy accepted the main responsibility for fighting the Japanese. These actions on the part of the United States probably prevented the Japanese from launching an attack against the USSR in Siberia. Soviet capacity to resist the German army would have been much less if it had been forced simultaneously to cope with the Japanese army in Siberia.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Soviet tenth-grade world history textbook asserts, "The use of atomic weapons against Japan was not

provoked by a military necessity. This inhuman act served long-term political goals: to intimidate the nations of the world and force them to bow before the power of the USA." According to the Soviet author the fate of the Japanese was sealed by the Soviet entry into the war on August 8, 1945; the atomic weapons were not needed.

There is no doubt that American leaders recognized that the atomic raids might strengthen the American position in the post-war era. But this was not why the raids were ordered. At the time, despite the sad state of Japan's defenses, there was no intimation that Japan was about to surrender. It appeared to many that an invasion of the home islands would be necessary to persuade the Japanese to quit the war. Estimates of civilian and military casualties from such an invasion ranged up to a million. So the atomic raids were conducted primarily to avoid the heavy loss of casualties expected from an invasion of the home islands.

Origins of the Cold War

Few topics are more complex or controversial than details of Soviet-American relations at the end of World War II and the years that followed. Judgments each side made about the behavior of the other during this period have influenced perceptions and affected relationships until the present time.

Textbooks are not immune from these judgments. Indeed to a considerable degree each country gives special attention to the manner in which the "cold war" is presented to its youth. Any effort to increase understanding and to build trust and respect for the other nation must include particular attention to the way in which textbooks treat the "cold war."

The vast majority of American scholars would disagree with the explanations provided in Soviet textbooks for the causes of the "cold war." But rather than engage in a point-by-point refutation of statements we believe incorrect, we wish to recommend that textbook authors assume a more detached approach and recognize that there were, on both sides, profound suspicions, fears, and memories of earlier tensions: these provided a setting in which the behavior of either side was easily misperceived and misinterpreted by the other so as to confirm its worst expectations. This in turn provoked overreaction and thus set off another cycle of the action-reaction spiral which little by little, brought about what we refer to as the "cold war."

To perceive the process in this way does not mean that the causes of the "cold war" were merely problems of communication. Nor need it imply symmetry of responsibility or a moral equivalence between the two sides. But it may help avoid the present situation in which the textbooks of one side charge the other with total responsibility for what transpired.

Soviet textbook authors should also be encouraged to include the texts of wartime agreements in their books so that students can judge for themselves what each side agreed to do or failed to do. Furthermore, textbook writing would improve if there were collaborative research between scholars from both nations who might seek to narrow the differences on the most contentious points of the "cold war."

Contemporary American Society

Textbooks have a responsibility to report as fairly as possible the nature of everyday life for the majority of people in the other nation. To comment upon only the negative features leaves distorted impressions in the minds of youth.

The Soviet tenth-grade world history textbook devotes eleven pages to a summary of the main features of American society since 1945. Much is factually correct but the sum of the discussion is seriously imbalanced and distorted. The author focuses the reader's attention upon such topics as the "military-industrial complex"; the creation of military alliance aimed at "containing" the Soviet Union; American-dominated multinational corporations; "McCarthyism"; strikes, unemployment and disparities in worker income; inflation; the assassinations of John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King; Vietnam; farm problems; racism and the civil rights movement; and restrictions on the American Communist Party. It is appropriate that these topics be included

in any treatment of the United States, but by themselves and without a presentation of the dynamic character of American society, Soviet students will gain an incomplete picture.

Although Americans have faced a range of social problems in the period since World War II, they remain largely satisfied with their institutions and way of life. It has been a period of rapid and widespread social change that has affected for the better the place of women and various ethnic and racial minorities in society. The acceptable range of life styles has grown and the United States has become increasingly pluralistic. At the same time and despite marked shifts in social mores, there has been remarkable stability. The cement which has held the country together has been a material abundance and a shared faith in constitutional processes, the nature of which the world has seldom seen.

Americans enjoy the benefits of the astonishing economic and technological changes of the past three decades. Despite inflation, median family income -- at $17,000 in 1978 -- has increased faster than prices in the 1970's. The availability of consumer goods is amazing. In 1978 the 150 million Americans aged 18 or more owned 140 million television sets, 340 million home radios, and 160 million telephones. They registered 110 million motor vehicles, and drove them 1,500,000 miles per year. A total of 70,000,000 Americans owned their own homes.

The lower classes, too, lived much more comfortably than they had before 1960. A total of 25 million Americans were defined as

"poor" in 1978, a definition which placed the poverty line at $6,000 for a non-farm family of four. This was only 12% of the people, compared to 25% in 1959. Meanwhile, government spending for social welfare jumped (in constant dollars) from $355 per capita in 1950 to $1,000 in 1970 to more than $1,500 in the late 1970's. Such expenditures accounted for 9% of the Gross National Product in 1950, 15% in 1970, and 21% in 1976. These increases represented a quiet revolution in national priorities -- from military spending in the 1950's and 1960's to domestic welfare in the 1970's. During this period the proportion of the Federal budget devoted to military defense declined steadily -- a picture quite contrary to that presented in Soviet textbooks and to developments in the USSR.

Much more than ever before, the federal government offered large-scale financial aid to encourage education, the arts and the humanities. Whether such aid improved the quality of schooling or of artistic creativity is of course debatable. But there is no denying the variety of American cultural life, or the much increased use that a literate, well-educated public has been making of museums, art galleries, concert halls, theaters, and movies. Critics who perceive the United States as a money-mad, sports-crazy civilization fail to recognize the vitality of American community and cultural life. Moreover, American popular culture -- whether in clothing, music, film, or dance -- is closely followed by people world-wide and influences fashion trends in nearly every nation.

Above all, more than material abundance holds the United States together. For all their divisions, Americans share a faith in constitutional proceses. They continue to believe instinctively in republican government, in the rule of law, in basic rights and freedoms of individuals. If they sometimes fall short of upholding such ideals in practice, they are none-the-less quick to protest when basis rights appear threatened. This consensus on constitutional fundamentals has done much to promote an atmosphere of freedom and tolerance, to soften socio-economic divisions, and to promote the stability and comity of civilization in the United States. Soviet textbooks should also say this about America.

SOME TOPICS DESERVING IMPROVED TREATMENT IN SOVIET GEOGRAPHY TEXTBOOKS

Soviet students learn about the geography of the United States in grades six and nine. The sixth-grade textbook -- a physical geography of the continents -- devotes about 28 pages to the United States and Canada; the ninth-grade textbook -- an economic geography of the world -- assigns 30 pages to a treatment of the United States. Such limited space contributes to superficial coverage.

Both books suffer somewhat from the employment of out-of-date information, but the sixth-grade book is the worst offender of the two. Both devote an inordinate amount of attention to such issues as American racial problems, unemployment, income

inequalities, and U.S. treatment of developing countries. These texts dwell on the negative aspects of the life of American black people and Indians, while ignoring the improvements that have taken place over the last 25 years. Approximately five to six times more space is given to minority populations than is accorded to the characteristics and problems of the white ethnic majority. This would be comparable to a survey of the population of the USSR that makes only minimal reference to the Slavic peoples. The Soviet texts frequently quote statistics pertaining to U.S. unemployment, increases in the cost of living, and income differentials but never cite the steady absolute increases in employment, the exponential growth of wages resulting in major long-term gains in real income, or the high standard of living for the average American citizen.

Both books regard many basic problems -- such as those associated with urbanization, inequalities in regional development, and environmental degradation -- as endemic to capitalist societies rather than as the globally pervasive problems they are. These problems are examined in great detail in the sections dealing with the United States and virtually ignored in the treatment of socialist countries.

The Soviet textbooks seem particularly deficient in their handling of two important geographical concepts: regional development and urbanization. We have selected these topics for special criticism and advice.

Regional Development in the United States

The authors of the economic geography text employ an out-of-date scheme for classifying regional divisions in the United States, a scheme used by Lenin at the turn of the century in his book The History of Capitalism in Russia. This system, depending upon three historically labeled macroregions -- the "Industrial North," the "Former Slaveholding South," and the "Colonized West" -- complicates accurate regional discussion. This regionalization scheme requires the authors to group dissimilar areas, such as the Dakotas and California, into one unwieldy region and to account for contemporary regional development with an increasingly irrelevant historical classification. While the authors sometimes ignore the logical requirements of the scheme in order to account for recent changes, the scheme is a hindrance to clear thought. Future revisions of the textbook must confront this problem if some of the most significant changes in regional development in the United States are to be included.

What are some of the changes in regional development in the United States that deserve special attention? Soviet textbooks need to be brought up-to-date on the shifting pattern of inter-regional or interstate population migration that has occurred in the United States, especially during the past decade because some of the traditional migration patterns have been reversed. Since 1930, the basic migrational flows have been the influx of both the black and white population of the South into the American Manu-

facturing Belt and the long-distance movement of many Northerners to the climatically attractive states of California and Florida. The major migrational change since 1970 has been the transformation of the American Manufacturing Belt, which encompasses the massive urban centers in the northeastern quarter of the United States, from an area with significant population gains into a region of large-scale net migrational losses, essentially to the South but also to the Southwest and California (the "Sunbelt" states). In the relatively brief span from 1970 to 1976, the American Manufacturing Belt had a net migrational loss of two million people while the South recorded a net gain of three million (including foreign immigrants). Even though one-half of the migrational induced population increases in the South occurred in Florida, every Southern state except Mississippi and Louisiana experienced net migrational gains and every state in the American Manufacturing Belt except Wisconsin had net migrational losses, with the sharpest declines found in New York and Ohio. Many surveys indicate that climatic variables appear to be preeminent in migrational decision-making, but they are reinforced by the growing number of employment opportunities in certain Western and Southern states derived from large-scale government investment and, even more, from the burgeoning growth of technologically advanced industry in this zone. An important part of the migration from the North to the South has been the recent return of blacks who had left the South to obtain urban employment and to escape oppressive

racial restrictions that once existed there.

The regional shifts in population are associated with equally pronounced changes in the spatial distribution of manufacturing which is both a cause and an effect of the population changes. Prior to World War II, the American Manufacturing Belt accounted for over four-fifths of the value added by U.S. manufacturing whereas in 1975, the relative share of this region in manufacturing had declined to 53 per cent. In the latter year, the South (or more appropriately the New South) was responsible for over one-fourth of the manufacturing product and the three Pacific Coast states accounted for an additional 12 per cent. Moreover, these regions and other states in the Southwest and Rocky Mountain regions now have a manufacturing base which consists of the newest and most technologically advanced industrial sectors and enterprises, such as electronic computers, aeronautical complexes, petrochemicals and specialized machinery plants.

One of the decisions industrial enterprises and corporations in the American Manufacturing Belt must make is whether to keep the older manufacturing enterprises competitive by major technological renovation at existing sites or whether these objectives can be accomplished more effectively by building a new plant in the suburbs of the same metropolitan area or in a new region. Until recent years, the choices usually have been to modernize at existing sites or, even more frequently, to build a new plant in the suburbs. The third option of moving or branching out to a new

region, however, has become an increasingly attractive alternative which already has had a profound impact on the pattern of U.S. regional development.

Another of the most important changes in regional development in the United States has been the increased efforts of the federal government to reduce regional inequalities in income and particularly to help the poorest regions. The federal government started a major program to resolve these problems in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961; more comprehensive area-development laws have been passed since that time. These laws designate regions with high unemployment rates and low per-capita income for the allocation of funds to help expand or create industries, public facilities, vocational education opportunities and modern health facilities, particularly regional hospitals, in order to bring the lagging regions, especially in the Appalachians, up to the level of the most advanced regions. Although the regional allocations under the federal programs have been relatively modest, many of the objectives of these programs have been attained because of the major locational shifts in capital investment to peripheral regions cited above and the income gains derived from the rejuvenation of the coal industry of the Appalachians. According to virtually every analysis of income statistics for U.S. states and regions, regional income inequalities were most pronounced in the early 1930's and since that time they have persistently declined. At present, real income differentials among regions in the U.S. are

relatively modest because of such factors as a national minimum wage, the growing strength of labor unions in the South, the shifts of poor rural population to higher-income urban employment and the much greater spatial dispersion of industrial activity.

Urbanization

In general Soviet textbooks provide a dismal picture of life in American cities. (The only picture of U.S. housing in the sixth-grade textbook is of a slum in Harlem.) Nor is the approach to cities even-handed. In the sixth-grade book the caption under a photograph of "skyscrapers" in New York states that "the high cost of land forces capitalists to build these giants" whereas captions of "skyscrapers" in Havana or Warsaw (shown in the economic geography book) cite the beauty of these buildings and their symbolic indication of progress.

The textbook for economic geography asserts, "Urbanization under the conditions of capitalism causes many problems. The conditions of urban life systematically grow worse." We think this judgment to be too harsh and demands qualification. That major cities have experienced difficulties cannot be denied. On the other hand, a large number of younger cities and rejuvenated older cities are prospering from every point of view. Considerable evidence can be offered to support the argument that conditions in metropolitican areas, including suburban areas (where a steadily increasing majority of the urban population reside), have improved

in recent decades with respect to such indicators as the growth of average, per capita, real person income, the level of health care as reflected in increased average longevity, the pervasiveness of modern, single-family homes, average educational levels, automobile and television ownership, and many other measures. With respect to central cities, the ninth-grade textbook completely ignores the expansion of publicly subsidized housing, urban renewal, the busing of school children for racial balance, and major efforts to revitalize the central business districts of old cities.

Soviet authors should also correct the impression that urban blacks are confined to the central cities. The number of blacks living in suburbs has risen to one-fourth of the total black population of metropolitan areas and since 1970, suburbs have accounted for nearly one-half of the growth of the black-metropolitan-area population.

A surprising change in urban population since 1977 has been the faster growth rate of small towns and other non-metropolitan urban areas compared to the standard metropolitan areas of the United States. This seems to be a result of a combination of residential preferences for small towns within commuting distance of larger cities but not within formal metropolitan areas and the extensive spread in recent years of industries to relatively accessible small towns in order to avoid some of the dis-economies of scale in the larger cities. The accessibility of these towns to major metropolitan markets and sources of supply has been

increased substantially by the recent completion of a national network of modern, four-lane interstate highways linking every metropolitan area with over 100,000 inhabitants.

CONCLUSIONS: WHAT SOVIET YOUTH KNOW ABOUT THE UNITED STATES FROM THEIR HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY TEXTBOOKS

From grades five through ten Soviet youth have many opportunities through their history and geography courses to learn about the United States and about the history of relationships between the United States and the USSR. Once the students leave school, many specific facts will be forgotten; what will be left is a set of images, impressions, and beliefs that may remain firm in the minds of Soviet people for a very long time. No one can say for certain what these images are. But we have tried to speculate about the images Soviet youth would likely hold if they had to depend solely upon their textbooks for information about the United States.

The View of Soviet Youth about the United States

On the basis of their textbooks Soviet students know that the United States is a rich, powerful nation with many resources. They also think that the United States is run by a few rich and powerful people who owe their influence to their positions in banks and large corporations. Public policy is largely directed to serve their interests. Because Soviet students lack information about how public decisions are made in the United States, they

believe that the typical American has little or no opportunity to influence public policy, despite guarantees contained in the Constitution.

From their history and geography textbooks Soviet youth learn that there is great social inequality in the United States. A few Americans are very rich; a large proportion live comfortably; but life is grim for perhaps as many as one-third of the population who are unable to buy sufficient food, purchase adequate medical care, and afford decent housing. Because they are told that robbery and assault are common, they also think that life is dangerous in the United States. Meanwhile, black people, American Indians, and other ethnic and racial minority groups suffer from extreme forms of persecution.

Despite the material wealth enjoyed by many Americans, life in the United States is characterized by decadence, alienation, poverty, and misery. The United States is a militarily powerful and aggressive nation; it is also a spiritually weak one. At least this is what Soviet youth are likely to believe if they depend solely upon their textbooks.

The View of Soviet Youth about US/USSR Relations

The textbooks teach Soviet youth to believe that American business and political leaders did not approve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, have despised the socialist system that arose from the October Revolution, and have tried to destroy it on several

occasions. American workers, meanwhile, have long been attracted to Marxism -- when they were not misled by labor leaders -- and have on occasion supported Soviet policies.

Soviet youth learn about American intervention after World War I but know little or nothing about food relief sent to the USSR in the 1920's. They are likely to assume that not extending diplomatic recognition to the USSR until 1933 was part of the American government's strategy to destroy it.

The textbooks teach Soviet youth that the United States helped arm Germany and Japan prior to World War II and hoped these countries would attack the USSR. According to Soviet texts, the United States finally joined the war as an ally of the Soviet Union only after it became apparent that German and Japanese successes would threaten American economic interests world-wide. Still, the United States was a reluctant ally. It nursed the hope that somehow Germany and the Soviet Union would destroy each other. Thus, American leaders postponed the long-promised second front until it was apparent that the Soviet Union had broken the back of the German army and was certain to win. Then the United States and Britain launched an invasion of Europe in order to be present to claim the spoils of war and to participate in the peace settlement.

From their textbooks Soviet youth know that there was some kind of fighting underway in the Pacific from 1941-1945, but it was of less importance than the war in Europe. Moreover, it was

easily settled once the USSR entered the war against Japan on August 8, 1945.

The United States used the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki not for the purpose of ending the war -- this was settled by the Soviet entry into combat -- but to blackmail the USSR during the post-war period. The use of the atomic bombs caused needless civilian deaths for the selfish purpose of securing post-war political advantage.

The Soviet textbooks stress that despite American attempts to intimidate the USSR, World War II marked a turning point in history, as it marked a major triumph for the social forces. Since that time the "imperialists" led mainly by the United States have struggled to extend their domination over large portions of the world; the socialists, led by the USSR, have resisted these efforts while seeking to maintain peace. The future is certain: the socialists will win and the imperialists will lose.

If the above paragraphs accurately convey the image that Soviet youth have of the United States and US/USSR relations, their impressions would be consistent with Soviet goals for history and geography instruction cited earlier. The task of increasing understanding and respect for other people requires more than minor textbook changes. It must become a goal of history and geography instruction, equal in status to goals of building loyalty and commitment to one's own country. Only then will it be possible to eliminate many of the problems of bias and prejudice that afflict textbooks.

CHAPTER III -- SOVIET CRITICISM OF AMERICAN TEXTBOOKS*

A detailed analysis of the interpretation of individual aspects of Soviet history and geography in American textbooks would take much space and cannot be accomplished in a brief survey. So, the purpose of this chapter is to summarize the principal, critical observations of Soviet experts to the 25 textbooks provided by the United States.

PART I. PRESENTATION OF SOVIET HISTORY FROM THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION TO THE PRESENT

1. What strikes the eye is the fact that the textbooks under review differ greatly in their coverage of the problems of Soviet history. The overwhelming majority of the textbooks supply only a brief overview of Soviet history, particularly the country's internal developments. Major attention is devoted to Soviet foreign policy. [illegible] textbooks do not provide the most basic information about the Soviet Union's political and socio-economic system, its economy, culture and so on.

2. Some of the textbooks speak disparagingly of our country, its history and its leaders. Certain authors think it unnecessary even to supply the accurate name of the Soviet state and call it "Russia" or "the Soviets" instead of the USSR.

---

*This chapter is based upon the preliminary draft provided by the Soviet Textbook Commission. Except for minor grammatical and stylistic changes, it is printed here in the form it was received.

3. The books under review contain a good deal of tendentious and biased information about the October Revolution, and there are quite a few errors. The majority of the textbooks present the Great October Revolution as a chance event brought about by the haphazard concurrence of circumstances and the activities of a few daring, lucky and determined individuals.

Meanwhile, a host of historical research papers have long made it clear that the October Revolution was the result of all of Russia's preceding historical development, that is, a phenomenon governed by the course of history. This point is forcefully illustrated by the fact that three revolutions took place in Russia within 12 years. The October Revolution was inevitable, owing to the deep contradictions intrinsic to the socio-economic and political system of old Russia.

There are factual mistakes in describing the collapse of autocracy. It is asserted that the Bolsheviks had very little to do with it. Meantime, hundreds of research papers have documented the vigorous and effective role the Bolsheviks had to play in carrying out the February (March) revolution, which was the prologue to the October Revolution. The Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) disseminated throughout the country on February 27, 1917, read: "The strongholds of Russian tzarism have collapsed. . . . Raise aloft the red banner of insurrection all over Russia!" So, how

could the Bolsheviks be "surprised" by the abdication of Nicholas three days hence, on March 2?

It is likewise unreasonable to claim that the October Revolution was actually a coup d'etat carried out by a small band of Bolshevik extremists. These assertions do not tally with facts. First, the revolution, as has been stressed above, was carried out by the broad masses of the working people led by the working class. Power was taken by the Soviets, which were mass-scale organizations uniting the broadest sections of the working people. The revolution had been preceded by peasant uprisings involving tens of millions of the rural population and the mass strikes of the workers demanding the transfer of power to the Soviets. Second, the Bolshevik Party was not a mere handful of unimportant extremists, but a mass party that had emerged long before the revolution, that had its own scientific program and newspapers, that united advanced workers and progressive intellectuals and that had substantial influence among the masses of the working people. By the October Revolution the Party numbered over 350,000 members and enjoyed the confidence of the majority of the trade unions, factory committees and other broad-based organizations of the people.

Some of the textbooks assert that on the eve of November 7, 1917, the Bolsheviks continued to be in the minority in the Soviets. It is well known that from late August 1917, the

Soviets had been shifting to the side of the Bolsheviks; and by November 1917, the majority of the Soviets fully supported them, a fact reflected in the composition of the Second All-Russia Congress of the Soviets as indicated by party affiliations. There were 390 Bolsheviks among the 649 delegates to the Congress.

4. The majority of the textbooks call V. I. Lenin "Nikolai Lenin." It is common knowledge that Lenin is an alias of V. I. Ulyanov. For a long time Lenin did sign his works by the alias "N. Lenin." However, it has become common practice to call him by his name and patronymic in combination with his best known alias, that is, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

Trying to prove that the Bolsheviks were weak and few in number, the authors of many textbooks allege that their success was a result of the assistance of Kaiser's Germany rather than their reliance on the broad masses of workers and peasants. A number of textbooks directly link the revolution to the "shipping" of Lenin to Russia by the German government.

These allegations distort facts. The circumstances of the passage of Lenin and a number of other political emigres from Switzerland to Russia in April 1917 were clarified in detail way back in 1917 and corroborated and authenticated by the leading representatives of international Social Democracy. No new documents that could somehow call into question these circumstances have appeared since, nor are there any.

5. The circumstances of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany in March 1918 are also sufficiently well known. The conclusion of the peace treaty had been preceded by heavy and fierce battles of Soviet Russia's troops with the German forces. Lenin sent the country an appeal, "The Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!", and urged the people "to defend every position to the last drop of blood." (Lenin, Collected Works, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, vol. 27, p. 30.) So, it was farthest from the Bolsheviks' minds to "surrender" to imperialist Germany, as certain textbooks allege.

6. The majority of the history and geography textbooks under review either circumvent questions related to the political and state system of the USSR or resort to derogatory epithets like "police state," "totalitarian regime," "un-democratic system" and so on. Certain textbooks go so far as to equate the Soviet political system to the fascist system of Hitler Germany. A number of textbooks present school children with an extremely distorted and simplistic picture of the Soviet political system: the country has allegedly been governed by "dictators." Only a few textbooks make an attempt to characterize the Soviet political system in greater detail and in terms that at least vaguely resemble reality.

None of the textbooks reports, for example, that the Soviet political system consists of government and mass organizations:

the Communist Party, the Soviet state and broad-based mass organizations of the working people, including trade unions, the Young Communist League, unions of intellectuals, and so on. Almost all textbooks present the role of the Communist Party in a distorted light. The assertions of certain authors that "this Party rules the Soviet people as autocratically as any tsar" are a gross falsification. It is likewise untrue that the Party decides all questions about the life of the country, while government bodies only rubberstamp and execute those decisions.

The Communist Party really is the leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, establishing general guidelines for the development of society and Soviet domestic and foreign policies. This was formulated in the 1936 Soviet Constitution and reiterated in the 1977 Constitution.

Major government acts are preliminarily discussed by the Communist Party at its Congresses or at the Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee. For instance, guidelines for the country's five-year economic development plans are discussed and approved by the Party Congresses. They provide the groundwork for the government bodies to draft five-year plans, which are thoroughly analyzed and approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Similar procedures are followed in other matters. Here is, for instance, how the new Soviet Constitution was adopted. The

USSR Supreme Soviet formed a constitutional commission, which prepared a draft. It was considered and approved by the Plenary Meeting of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Later, the draft was submitted for a nation-wide discussion, in the course of which a number of amendments and additions were suggested. The draft was finalized according to them and considered anew by the Plenary Meeting of the Party Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and presented for ultimate endorsement by the USSR Supreme Soviet. A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet thoroughly analyzed and discussed the draft and only then endorsed it.

It is absolutely untrue that "the Supreme Soviet cannot propose and pass its own laws." This is disproved by the entire practice of Soviet legislation. For instance, in the past ten years the USSR Supreme Soviet has approved many laws drafted by commissions according to legislative initiative existing within both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

It is incorrectly asserted that only Communists are elected to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. There are non-Party members of the Presidium as well. We cannot but disagree with the allegations of certain authors that the Soviets have no real power. In actual fact, the Soviets have all power, both in the center and elsewhere. This has been written into all Soviet Constitutions

and reiterated in the 1977 Constitution. Article 2 reads: "All power in the USSR belongs to the people. The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR. All other state bodies are under the control of, and accountable to, the Soviets of People's Deputies."

It should be pointed out that almost all authors of the textbooks, as a rule, ignore Soviet legislation, including the Constitutions. Virtually none of the American textbooks traces developments and changes in the political system of Soviet society or describes the growth and extension of Soviet democracy.

7. An historical process of major importance -- i.e., the formation of the multinational federated state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), in 1922 -- has not been represented correctly either. Some of the textbooks interpret it as a mere change in the name of Russian Empire which allegedly took place immediately after the October Revolution. Others present the formation of the USSR as a result of the fact that by 1922 the Communists had conquered nearly all of the lands that had been part of the Russian Empire. None of the books gives the real fact; namely, this was a voluntary unification of equal Soviet socialist republics into a single federated state, a unification prompted by the vital interests of all Soviet republics, particularly small and backward ones.

The majority of the textbooks overlook the formation of independent Soviet republics by the nations of Russia after the victory of the October Revolution. Some of the textbooks mention this fact, but not comprehensively or correctly. The formation of national state entities is explained erroneously. It is never explained that the nationality policy of the Soviet state was based on the principle of the right of nations to self-determination up to secession and formation of independent states. This was proclaimed by the Soviet Government in the historic Declaration of the Rights of the Nations of Russia on November 2 (15), 1917. In keeping with this principle a number of independent Soviet republics were formed in the country as well as several autonomous republics and regions within the Russian Federation. Some authors allege that the union and autonomous republics are self-governing "only in minor matters." It is only necessary to read the Soviet Constitution to learn that both union and autonomous republics have extensive powers and resolve many important problems relating to their political, economic and cultural life.

Neither can we agree with the erroneous assertion that political power rests chiefly with Russians. All nationalities of the USSR regardless of their size are absolutely equal. This has been guaranteed by all Soviet Constitutions, beginning with the 1918 Constitution and ending with the 1977 Constitution.

We think it unscientific and uncovincing on the part of certain authors to cite "anonymous letters," "anonymous interviews"

and "verses" by authors totally unknown to the Soviet reading public. All this, whether the authors want it or not, fosters hostility towards the USSR among American school children.

8. Problems of Soviet Socio-Economic Policy and Economic Growth.

Several American history and, particularly, geography textbooks give considerable space to questions of Soviet economic policy and economic growth. Some of them provide general characteristics of the socialist economic system and correctly point out that it is based on the public ownership of the means of production. They comment on the existence of two forms of public property -- i.e., state and cooperative property -- and on the tolerance for private property. However, the explanation that "state" property belongs to the government must be judged unsatisfactory. State property is the property of the entire people, managed by the government and its bodies. It is also an error to assert that "the people work for the government." The Soviet people work for themselves and for society rather than for the government. It is a gross mistake to allege, as certain textbooks do, that the people of Soviet Russia are not free to select their own jobs. The Soviet Constitution guarantees every Soviet citizen the right to work, including the right to choose his or her trade or profession, type of job and to work in accordance with their interests, abilities, training and education, and with due regard for the needs of society. This right is

ensured by the socialist economic system, the steady growth of the productive forces, free vocational and professional training, improvement of skills, training in new trades or professions, and the development of the system of vocational guidance and job placement.

A number of textbooks describe the Soviet economy more or less substantially, outline the main stages of its growth, and also its problems. At the same time they are not free from errors.

For instance, the Soviet Union's economic growth during the prewar and postwar five-year periods is incorrectly explained by the allegations that people at that time had to put in more hours. This is wrong. It was during the first five-year period that the change from the eight-hour to the seven-hour working day was effected in the USSR. In 1940 the eight-hour working day was re-introduced in view of the impending war, but in the 1950's the seven-hour working day was re-established. The taxation policy of the Soviet state is also described incorrectly. Throughout the postwar period taxes in the Soviet Union, far from growing, have been steadily decreasing. Stable and comparatively low prices have been maintained for food and consumer goods.

In explaining the reasons behind the lower productivity of Soviet industry as compared with American, some authors cite, along with correct reasons, erroneous ones, such as "low standard

of living of workers." They allege without any proof whatsoever that Soviet workers with low incomes "cannot buy the variety of foods, such as meat and dairy products, which can help them work better." This is untrue. The consumption of meat and dairy products in the Soviet Union is growing from one year to the next, and workers and their families constitute the majority of the Soviet population. (Detailed data are supplied by the yearbooks National Economy of the USSR published by the Central Statistical Board.) The allegation about "crowded living quarters" is just as biased. The Soviet Union is building more housing than any other country. Between 1961 and 1975 alone, over 165 million Soviet people moved to newly-built apartments or improved their housing conditions in other ways. Incidentally, the Soviet Union has the world's lowest rents amounting to not more than three or four per cent of the worker's wages. Moreover, the rents have been maintained at such a level for several dozen years.

Quite erroneous and inadmissible is the position of authors who claim that in the Soviet Union, workers' freedoms are limited in many ways, that workers are often placed in jobs according to government needs, and that they may not change jobs unless the government agrees. All this is untrue and, moreover, slander. Soviet government agencies have no right to allocate people to jobs without their consent. They may appeal to workers, particularly young people, to go to one area or another to new construction pro-

jects, land development schemes and so on. The Communist Party, the government, and the Young Communist League frequently launch such appeals, which inevitably evoke enthusiastic response.

Any Soviet worker is free to choose his job. The only limitation is that he should warn the management of the enterprise or organization where he is working about his intention to quit two weeks in advance of his leaving.

The Soviet working people have a direct say in production through their trade unions and permanent production conferences. They show much interest in the steady growth of production. This is illustrated particularly vividly by socialist competition, in which the overwhelming majority of workers take part.

It is groundlessly asserted that in the Soviet country the trade unions lack the freedom to strike and that this has enabled the Soviet government to keep wages very low and to pay no attention to the production of consumer goods. All this, from beginning to end, is fallacious.

First, there is no law banning the freedom to strike in the USSR. However, workers have no need to resort to strikes in the Soviet Union as distinct from the capitalist countries, where workers frequently can force their capitalistic exploiters to meet their legitimate demands only by industrial action. In the USSR the state itself, to which the factories belong, take care to increase steadily the wages and salaries of factory and office

workers (they went up by 81 per cent between 1961 and 1975), and to improve working conditions, pension schemes, and so on.

Second, the rapid growth rates of Soviet industry are explained by the superiority of a planned socialist economy, the high productive activity of workers, engineers, technicians and managers, and the combined effect of material and moral incentives.

Third, the number of durable cultural and household goods bought by the population is continually growing as a result of the rapid expansion of their production and the rising purchasing power of the working people. Relevant statistics are to be found in the yearbooks of the Central Statistical Board. The living standards in the USSR have been steadily growing: from 1961 to 1975 the real per capita income doubled. Moreover, in the 1960's and 1970's the growth rates of the consumer-oriented industries became almost identical with those of heavy industry.

One world history textbook describes the system of pay at Soviet state-owned factories and correctly points out that workers are paid "according to the skill and the amount of their work." However, the authors come to the conclusion that Soviet socialism "does not mean equal pay. . ." The school child may get the impression that this is a specific feature of "Soviet socialism." Meanwhile, this principle operates in any social society because it stems from the fundamental principle of scientific socialism:

"From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work."

The textbooks incorrectly present the history of the development of the socialist economy. It is asserted, in particular, that only after some years of floundering the Bolsheviks decided that a socialist economy could be built only by careful planning from the center and that this circumstance explains why the five-year plans were launched only in 1928.

This does not correspond to reality. The first steps of the Soviet government in reorganizing the economy along socialist lines date back to November 1917, when the state assumed control over banks and enterprises and established workers' control at all privately-owned industrial and commercial enterprises. The capitalists fiercely opposed workers' control and resorted to sabotage and deliberate stoppages. The Soviet government retaliated by nationalizing the enterprises of the saboteurs. Later, entire industries were nationalized. Between 1918 and 1920 all major and medium-size industries passed into state control.

The world imperialist war and the intervention of the capitalist states in Soviet Russia and the Civil War, which lasted three years, disrupted industry and the national economy at large. From 1921 to 1925 the country's economy was rehabilita-

ted and in the second half of the 1920's the Soviet people began carrying out their history-making tasks, that is, the industrialization of the country and the social and technical reconstruction of agriculture in keeping with Lenin's plan for building socialism in the USSR. These tasks were accomplished during the early five-year periods.

Planning for the growth of the Soviet socialist economy is accomplished by law. The first long-term plan for the electrification of Russia, known by its Russian abbreviation GOELRO, was drafted as early as 1920. It was calculated for 10 to 15 years and mapped out specific targets for building power stations and developing industry, transportation and agriculture. In the mid-1920's target figures for national economic growth began to be set for every year and work on drafting the first five-year economic development plan got underway. It was approved in 1929. Since that time the Soviet economy has been developed on the basis of five-year plans.

We cannot but disagree with textbook appraisals of Soviet economic growth in the 1960's and 1970's. There was no crisis of planning in the 1960's. The restructing of the management of industry and construction (economic reform) which was achieved in the second half of the 1960's enhanced the economic independence of enterprises but in no way reduced the role of the centrally-

planned structure of the Soviet economy.

It is untrue that "a large proportion of national income was plowed back into industry rather than being made available to consumers" in the USSR. In actual fact four-fifths of the Soviet national income are used for consumption (if we include outlays for housing construction and the building of social and cultural services).

Contrasting heavy and light industries in terms of consumer interest, presented by certain textbook authors, cannot withstand criticism: it is common knowledge that consumer goods cannot be manufactured and agricultural production cannot be expanded without metal.

9. The vast majority of the American history and geography textbooks present an extremely simplistic and distorted picture of the conversion of farming from small-scale privately-owned farms to large-scale, socialist collective ones (Kolkhoz). The usual way to explain this process is as follows: during the first five-year period, when the country began to industrialize, the Soviet state needed a lot of grain to feed the workers and to increase exports in order to pay for machinery and equipment. In order to obtain grain more easily from the farmers, Stalin decided to force them into collective farms and launched his plan in 1929.

This interpretation is a gross lie. First, socialist transformations in the countryside through the voluntary conversion of farmers from small-scale, privately-owned enterprises to large-scale collective farms was a specific goal of the Communist Party and one of the basic elements of Lenin's plan for building socialism in Russia (Lenin's plan for cooperation of agriculture). This need was prompted, above all, by the interests of the toiling peasants themselves because small farms could not become prosperous. It was also prompted by the interests of society as a whole because only large-scale mechanized agriculture could meet the country's needs for food and agricultural raw materials.

Second, in the early years of Soviet government farmers began forming collective farms on a voluntary basis. But the state did not have the necessary resources to help the farmers by providing tractors and other machinery for the collective farms. However, the state was laying the groundwork for the mass-scale voluntary transition of peasants to collective production. The proper conditions came into being at the end of the 1920's; Soviet industry began producing tractors and more tractors were imported; the country's finances improved and the state was able to give financial aid to collective farms. Machine-and-tractor stations began to be built to serve the collective farms, and so on. The existing collective farms achieved good productivity and the peasants began to recognize the profitability of joint farming.

As a result, in the late 1920's and early 1930's, the peasants began joining collective farms en masse.

The principle of the peasants' joining collective farms on a voluntary basis was violated in certain localities. But the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and the Soviet government severely condemned these violations and took measures to preclude them.

It is untrue that, in 1973, the government said that it was time to shift from the smaller collective farms to the much larger state farms. The Soviet Union has always been pursuing a course for the continuous improvement of the management of both collective and state farms and for setting up inter-farm and agrarian-industrial associations and enterprises. However, there is no question of converting collective farms into state farms. In the 1950's some of the collective farms which were unable to recover from the damage done by the war were turned into state farms according to the requests of the collective farmers themselves. This was a great help to the farmers on the part of the state.

It is untrue that in years of poor harvest many farmers suffer from hunger. In the past few decades Soviet people have never suffered from hunger even in years of crop failures because the state takes the necessary measures to provide food for the population, in particular, by buying grain from the USA and other countries.

10. Soviet Foreign Policy

The interpretation of Soviet foreign policy in the American textbooks gives rise to serious objections. Historical practice shows, however, that there are no fundamental contradictions between the peoples of our two countries and that they have never been at war with each other. This fact continues to be very significant although there were dark pages in the history of relations between the two countries. The United States took part in an armed intervention in Soviet Russia. However, the Soviet and American peoples fought side by side against the block of aggressors in the Second World War. Class and ideological differences did not prevent the Soviet Union and the United States from pooling their efforts for the sake of achieving their common objective. These facts deserve to be mentioned in the textbooks.

It is clear to everyone that Soviet-American relations today can hardly be overestimated in terms of their importance by the destinies of humanity. The solution of the problems of peace and international security largely depends on the road they take. Perhaps, everyone will agree that the duty of the historians of our two countries is to contribute to the positive development of Soviet-American relations, thus promoting peace all over the world.

However, the American textbooks under review show an obvious tendency to distort the meaning and nature of Soviet foreign policy and the methods of its execution. Having read these textbooks,

American school children cannot help but gain an impression that the more characteristic features of Soviet foreign policy include aggressiveness, the striving to establish Soviet domination in the world, intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, fickleness, opportunism, and readiness to violate obligations under international agreements and treaties. The authors of the textbooks interpret the entire history of Soviet foreign policy as a series of actions leading toward extending "the Soviet sphere of domination."

It is from these positions that they explain many historical landmarks. At the same time American textbooks have little to say about positive shifts in East-West relations in the 1970's -- in particular, the improvement of Soviet-American relations -- and explain in a biased manner, if at all, the reasons behind these shifts.

It is claimed in a number of textbooks that from the outset, particularly before the 1920's, Lenin and the Soviet state were banking on the "export of revolution." In truth, Lenin always opposed this and pointed out that revolution developed in step with the scope and acuteness of social contradictions. Even the first decree of Soviet government, the Decree on Peace, reflected the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. In September 1919, Lenin wrote about the period "of the coexistence side by side of socialist and

capitalist states."[1] The efforts made by the Soviet country between 1917 and 1923 to establish and extend contacts with the capitalist states are described at length in a paper by the Soviet historian V. A. Shishkin.[2]

The allegation that Lenin and the Soviet government were working for world revolution up to 1921 is based on Trotskyist sources, which distort the genuine character of Leninist foreign policy. Lately, certain Western authors have admitted that the Soviet government has been pursuing a course for the normalization of relations with other countries since the beginning.

The textbooks under review also emphasize that Soviet foreign policy supposedly is a continuation of the policy of tsarism. We would like to stress here that the class content of the foreign policy of tsarist government and that of the foreign policy of the Soviet state are poles apart. While tsarist foreign policy reflected the interests of the capitalists and land-owners, whose purpose was conquest, the oppression of other nations, and frequently the solution of domestic problems with the help of military adventures, Soviet foreign policy represents the interests of the working people who have a vital stake in safeguarding and strengthening

---

[1]Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 30, p. 39.

[2]V. A. Shishkin, The Soviet State and Western Countries in 1917-1923. Essays on the History of Establishing Economic Relations, Leningrad, 1969. (In Russian).

peace because only a lasting peace can provide proper international conditions for building a communist society. The foreign policy of our country is directed at "ensuring international conditions favorable for building communism in the USSR," as stated in Article 28 of the Soviet Constitution.

11. In our view, the textbooks explain superficially and often erroneously the reasons behind the outbreak of the Second World War. The authors ignore historical facts that testify to the responsibility of certain Western circles for the failure of plans to establish a system of collective security in Europe.

The Munich agreements not only gave Czechoslovakia away to the fascist Reich, but they also had the goal of isolating the Soviet Union. Research published in the USA, Britain and France and the official documents of Western powers show that within their political circles there were some who believed it was possible to channel Hitler's aggression against the USSR. That is why explaining the "Munich policy" solely as a desire by Britain and France to "preserve peace" whatever the cost does not reflect its character.

The Soviet Union's position during the Czechoslovak crisis and after the Munich deal is not described at all. None of the textbooks mentions Soviet-British-French military talks in Moscow in the summer of 1939 and the disruption of these talks by the Western powers.

Some of the American textbooks assert that the Soviet Union pursued a similarly "rapacious" policy towards Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland. This does not accord with facts either. In the first three states objective conditions had taken shape for the restoration of Soviet power: Socialist revolutions that had been carried out there made it possible for the Baltic nations to re-unite with the other peoples of the USSR. As for Finland, there was no intention to seize it either. The intention was to move the Finnish border farther from Leningrad because of security considerations in exchange for certain northern territories of the USSR. By and large, instead of stressing "Finland's traditional resistance to Russian aggression," the authors should have mentioned that the country got its independence as a result of the victory of the October Socialist Revolution which proclaimed the right of all nations to self-determination up to cessation. A treaty on the recognition of Finland's independence was signed by Lenin in December 1917 and since that time the Soviet Union has always attempted to pursue a course for the extension of good relations between the two countries.

17. Soviet historians believe it necessary to draw attention to the fact that the chapters of the textbooks dealing with the Second World War play down the Soviet Union's decisive role in defeating the fascist Reich. The reader will look in vain for any mention of the Battles of Moscow and Kursk, the operations conducted by the Soviet Army in the Ukraine, in Byelorussia and

in Poland, and fierce fighting on the approaches to Berlin.

Some of the textbooks equate the El Alamein operation with the great Battle of Stalingrad as "the main turning points of the war."

The historical truth is that until June 1944 the Soviet Union fought a one-on-one battle against the monstrous military machine of fascist Germany, which relied on the resources of many European countries. The Soviet people not only checked the Nazi aggression, but destroyed the bulk of the Wehrmacht's forces, threw the enemy out of their country and helped the European peoples to shake off the yoke of Nazi occupation. Nazi Germany kept at the Soviet-German front from 55.3 (1944) to 76.7 (1942) per cent of its divisions. Throughout the war the Soviet armed forces annihilated, took prisoner, or routed 506 German divisions and about 100 divisions of Germany's satellites.[1] The decisive contribution of the USSR to the outcome of the Second World War, recognized in their day by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and US President Roosevelt, is a historical fact deserving to be known by the American youth.

While describing the developments at the Soviet-German front, American textbooks err in judging the reasons for the serious set-

---

[1] The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, 1941-1945. Short History, Moscow, 1970 (in Russian), p. 566.

backs of the Soviet Army in the early period of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people. The material superiority of the Wehrmacht, which relied on the resources of almost the whole of Europe, is never emphasized. The failure of the German "blitzkrieg" is explained by the tale of the "severe Russian winter," the difficulties encountered by the Wehrmacht in covering Russia's expanses, and other secondary factors.

We would like to draw attention of the American authors to their interpretation of the US aid to the Soviet Union under the Lend-Lease plan. To begin with, the Soviet government and our people were grateful to President Roosevelt's administration and the American people for the aid they gave us, which was only natural between allies. However, after the war American historiography began to exaggerate the importance of Lend-Lease for victory. Unfortunately, such exaggerations are to be found in the textbooks under review as well.

Historical facts do not bear out the views of the American authors. In 1941-42, Lend-Lease supplies were valuable to the USSR, which found itself in a difficult situation, but they could not have a decisive importance. In 1942, the USA supplied the USSR with 2,505 planes, 3,023 tanks and 78,964 motor vehicles. Altogether 12 per cent of the overall amount of US material delivered did not reach its destination because of the activity

of the enemy submarines and air force. In the same year of 1942 the USSR produced 25,436 planes and 24,446 tanks.[1] All told, in the wartime years Soviet industry, according to official data, produced over 134,000 planes, about 103,000 tanks and self-propelled guns, over 825,000 artillery guns and mortars.[2] The Lend-Lease supplies amounted to 12 per cent of the Soviet output in planes, ten per cent in tanks and five per cent in guns. Statements to the effect that after the war American help was "carefully disguised on Stalin's orders" also are untrue. Soviet literature has always cited official American data on supplies under the Lend-Lease agreement.

Some of the books claim that the USSR entered the war with Japan "too late to play any decisive role." In our view, several remarks are in order here: First, the date of the Soviet Union's entry into the war with Japan was set during a conference of the heads of state of the three powers, and the USSR fulfilled its obligation; second, the Soviet Army dealt a decisive blow to a major grouping of Japanese land forces in Manchuria and Korea, thereby giving a hand to the Allies; third, the Soviet Union's entry into the war doubtless had a considerable effect on the Japanese government's decision to surrender.

---

[1] History of World War II, 1939-1945, Moscow, 1975 (in Russian), pp. 48, 52.

[2] Pravda, May 9, 1977.

Soviet historians also take exception to textbook descriptions of the results and immediate consequences of the Second World War. The textbooks distort political processes that occurred in countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe after their liberation from Nazi occupation. All of the textbook authors insistently allege "Soviet expansion" and an "occupation" by the Soviet Union of European countries, which "lost freedom and independence" as a result. In our view, these assertions, which became widespread in Western propaganda during the "cold war," are pernicious and do not tally with historical evidence.

The Soviet Army entered the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe as a liberating army. The population of those countries, who had been languishing under the Nazi yoke for many years, met Soviet troops with joy and enthusiasm. The defeat of the fascist Reich brought about serious changes in the correlation of political forces in those countries. The patriotic elements which had been fighting Nazism became legal. It turned out that a considerable portion of the bourgeoisie had been compromised by cooperation with the Nazis. The popular masses wanted freedom and independence rather than the revival of undemocratic regimes. The formation of new bodies of government was accompanied by exacerbated class struggle. Developments in the Central and South-East European countries were affected by many objective factors and it is unscientific to ascribe them solely to the presence of Soviet troops.

The problem of reparations demanded by the Allies from defeated Germany is interpreted in a one-sided manner. Certain textbooks emphasize the allegedly unseemly position of the USSR which was receiving reparations.

At the Yalta Conference the Allies decided it was fair to require Germany to compensate for the damage done by its armies, in kind and to the greatest possible extent. The Potsdam Conference resolved that the Soviet Union was to receive reparations from the Soviet zone of occupation and, in addition, from the Western zones.

Therefore, by receiving reparations, the USSR was acting in accord with Allied decisions. It would be only just to note that the Soviet Union suffered greater damage from the war than any other country. Direct damage done to the USSR by Nazi aggression is estimated at 679,000 million roubles, while total damage, including military spending and lost revenue from the national economy, amounted to 2,569,000 million roubles.[1]

The end of the Second World War ushered in significant shifts in the correlation of forces in the world arena. Despite the enormous economic damage and loss of life suffered by the Soviet Union, it had substantially increased its prestige in international affairs. Popular democratic revolutions in countries of South-

---

[1]Cf. History of the Foreign Policy of the USSR, 1917-1976, vol. 1, 1917-1945, Moscow, 1976 (in Russian), p. 479.

Eastern and Central Europe and Asia provided conditions for the emergence and consolidation of the world socialist system.

13. After the war the antithesis of the political objectives of the socialist and capitalist countries came to a head. The ruling quarters of the latter attempted to dictate to the USSR solutions to major post-war problems. This led to a protracted period known as the "cold war."

The majority of the textbooks under review make the Soviet Union responsible for the "outbreak" of the "cold war." To this end they use the threadbare anti-Soviet and anti-Communist myths of American propaganda and historiography. In our view, this interpretation of historical facts is not objective. Churchill's Fulton speech against the Soviet Union, President Truman's line for securing US world supremacy, and Secretary of State Dulles's brinkmanship policy have not been approved unanimously in American historiography. Moreover, many leading historians do not limit themselves to accusing the USSR of a "lust for conquests" in trying to explain the reasons for and origins of the "cold war," but point to the links between US foreign policy and the domestic policy of certain American circles. These views are advocated by I. Siracusa (New Left Diplomatic Histories and Historians, New York, 1973), D. Fleming (The Cold War and Its Origin, Vol. I-II, New York, 1961), G. Alperovitz (Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam, the Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confronta-

tion with Soviet Power, New York, 1965) and others.

14. We believe that the arguments cited by certain textbooks as regards the Soviet Union's refusal to adopt the American plan for the "internationalization" of the entire atomic industry (Baruch Plan) needs clarification. American school children are likely to get the impression that the proliferation of the new weapon of mass destruction was all Stalin's fault. But this is not so. First, the authors never mention the fact that the US official circles at the time thought it necessary to preserve a monopoly over the atomic bomb for a long time to come. Second, the books do not comment on the weaknesses of the Baruch Plan, which actually did not provide for the discontinuation of the production of nuclear weapons (Cf. "A Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy," Washington, London, 1946, p. VI). Third, the authors do not mention the Soviet proposal of June 19, 1946, to draft an agreement for the complete and unconditional prohibition of the production and use of atomic weapons.

Certain textbooks say that the Soviet Union not only turned down US "selfless and generous aid" (Marshall Plan), but also "forbade" Central and South-East European countries from receiving it.

The Soviet Union was not opposed to participating in an international organization for the economic recovery of Europe and the use of US credits and aid for that purpose. However, it

resolutely opposed the attempts of certain US circles to use this aid for establishing political and economic control over European countries. Apart from that, the Soviet government had to take account of the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet bias of the Marshall Plan.

15. We cannot agree either with the interpretation of Soviet policy on the German issue in the textbooks under review. Some of them allege that the Soviet Union seldom complied with the agreements made at Yalta. Meanwhile, works by Soviet historians show that the USSR implemented all of the decisions of the Yalta Conference strictly, consistently and in full, including the provisions concerning Germany. The Soviet Union also fully implemented the decisions of the Potsdam Conference.[1] Incidentally, the textbooks say virtually nothing about the fact that at Potsdam the USSR, the USA and Britain reached agreement on principles of policy towards Germany, including the principles of de-militarization, de-Nazification, democratization and de-cartelization.

The Soviet Union is also accused of having failed to withdraw its armies from eastern Germany and to cooperate in working out a final peace treaty with Germany.

---

[1] P. A. Nikolayev, The Policy of the Soviet Union on the German Issue, 1945-1964, Moscow, 1966 (in Russian); V. Ya. Sipols, A. M. Filitov, "The Potsdam Conference and Its Decisions: A Victory of the Democratic Principles of the Post-War Peaceful Settlement in Europe," in: The USSR in the Struggle Against the Fascist Aggression, 1933-1945, Moscow, 1976 (in Russian).

In actual fact Soviet policy on the German issue was in full accord with the decisions of the Potsdam Conference. The USSR proceeded from the assumption that these decisions would provide the German people with prospects for restructuring their life along peaceable and democratic lines and eventually enable them to take their place among the free and peaceful nations of the world.

Also, the USSR bears no responsibility for the failure to conclude a peace treaty with Germany. As early as 1945-49 the Soviet Union made every effort to conclude a peace treaty, in particular, within the framework of the foreign ministers' council. However, the position of the Western powers, particularly the USA, was such that it was impossible to draft and conclude the treaty. The New York Times said on the eve of the council's Moscow meeting in 1947, for instance, that US Secretary of State Marshall was going to Moscow not to make peace with Germany, but to learn what price the USA will have to pay for this peace.

Two times, in 1952 and 1959, the USSR presented drafts of a possible treaty. The Western powers, however, turned them down and offered nothing in return.

It is untrue that the Soviet Union would not withdraw its troops from Eastern Germany. Here is one example. At the fourth meeting of the foreign ministers' council in Paris in May 1949 the USSR proposed that the governments of the four powers prepare within three months drafts of a peace treaty with Germany, including

a provision relating to the withdrawal of the occupation troops of all powers from German territory within one year after the conclusion of the treaty.

The Soviet proposal on the withdrawal of occupation troops from Germany was stubbornly opposed by the Western powers. Bevin stated directly at the session of the foreign ministers' council on June 21, 1949, that the British government was not prepared at the moment to bind itself to any timetable for the withdrawal of British troops from Germany. He said he did not want to give deceptive hopes to the Germans or anyone else, and made a point of having his statement entered into the minutes.[1]

16. The textbooks under review also claim that the USSR is to blame for the 1948-49 Berlin crisis. The authors say that the Soviet Union tried to force other countries to leave the city, set up a "blockade" of West Berlin to this end, but failed to gain anything because of the airlift organized by the USA and Britain.

What took place in real fact? On June 18, 1948, the Western powers announced that they were going to effect a separate money reform in their zones. The Soviet side was informed of this intention only two hours before the reform was due. As soon as

---

[1]Cf. "The Minutes of the 18th session of the foreign ministers' council on June 12, 1949," e.g., History of the Foreign Policy of the USSR, 1945-1975, vol. 2, Moscow, 1976 (in Russian), p. 85.

the news had become public knowledge, a deluge of money came into the Soviet occupation zone because it was no longer valid in western Germany. This was a real threat to the economy and financial system of the Soviet zone, and on the night of June 19 the Soviet Military Administration in Germany had to prohibit the admission of the new monetary units issued in the western zones into the Soviet zone. At the same time the Soviet military authorities had to regulate more closely the flow of people and commodities between the eastern zone, including Berlin, and the western zones.

At the same time the western sectors of Berlin had the opportunity to maintain normal contacts, including economic ones, with all of eastern Germany. The Soviet Military Administration expressed its willingness to supply the population with necessities.

The Western powers, however, claimed that the Soviet Union was "blockading" West Berlin, while actually organizing its self-blockade. The airlift staged by them became a costly propaganda campaign, and West Berlin itself turned into a focus of the cold war. The aim of Western politicians in exacerbating the situation around Berlin was revealed by John Foster Dulles, then State Department adviser, in his speech at the Association of American Journalists Abroad on January 10, 1949. According to him, the existing situation was beneficial to the United States from the point of view of propaganda.

Some of the American textbooks also claim that the measures taken by the German Democratic Republic on August 13, 1961, triggered one more "Berlin crisis." It is common knowledge, however, that the situation in Central Europe was steadily worsening because of the growing subversive activities of the Western powers, particularly West Germany, against the German Democratic Republic with the aim of overthrowing the socialist system in it; the open border between West Berlin and the German Democratic Republic was used for these ends.[1] The measures taken on August 13, 1961 helped promote peace because they effectively defused the dangerous source of tension in West Berlin. They were quite justified from the legal point of view, as American politicians themselves pointed out. For instance, William J. Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said on July 30, 1961, that the German Democratic Republic was within its rights to establish on the border with West Berlin controls that existed on the borders of all countries. "I don't understand why the East Germans do not close their borders, although they have the right to do so," he said.[2] Adenauer himself observed that the Americans had even tried to explain to

---

[1] Cf. A Book of Facts About West Berlin-Based Subversive Activities Against Socialist Countries, Moscow, 1960 (in Russian).

[2] The New York Times, August 3, 1961.

the Germans that the building of the wall was a good thing.[1]

The 1961 Berlin crisis was beneficial only to those who had a stake in continued tensions in the world. Small wonder that the US journal Nation pointed out that if there had been no Berlin crisis, it should have been invented.[2]

Lastly, some of the textbooks say that West Berlin belongs to the Federal Republic of Germany. This statement distorts facts. For instance, the agreement concluded between the USSR, USA, Britain and France on September 3, 1971, says that the governments of the French Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States of America state that contacts between the western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed with a view to the fact that those sectors still are not part of the Federal Republic of Germany and will not be governed by it in the future.

17. Almost all textbooks reduce the developments in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and 1968 and in Hungary in 1956 to intervention on the part of the Soviet Union, deliberately withholding information about internal processes in those countries, including the exacerbation of class struggle at certain stages of the social revolution,

---

[1] Frankfurte Allegemaine Zeitung, November 4, 1963.

[2] Nation, October 28, 1961, p. 280.

and the subversive activities of domestic counter-revolution and foreign agents. It is never said that reaction both in Czechoslovakia and Hungary was opposed by the masses of the working people who supported social and economic transformations. It should be stressed that the parliamentary regime was not destroyed in Czechoslovakia, as some of the textbooks claim. In 1948 the struggle between different political forces in Czechoslovakia was taking place within the constitutional framework.

18. In our view, it is wrong to characterize the Caribbean crisis and its settlement in 1962 as a "defeat" for the USSR. That settlement was a reasonable compromise: it became a landmark in the history of relations between the USSR and USA and forcefully demonstrated that the two countries can resolve very complex international problems.

We disagree with the explanation of the shifts towards detente in the seventies supplied by some of the American textbooks. The Soviet Union's striving for detente is explained away, for instance, by the accumulation of nuclear weapons, the "weakening" of the socialist system, and the deterioration of relations with China.

First, as we have already said, peaceful coexistence has been the consistent foreign-policy line of the Soviet state from its inception to the present day. In our view, the true reasons for positive shifts in international relations consist, above all, in the changed correlation of forces in the international arena,

the debacle of the "cold war" policy, and the mounting struggle of the broad masses in all countries against the threat of war and for international security. These factors were recognized by realistic Western politicians.

We think it is essential to point out that the textbooks under review interpret Soviet foreign policy in a one-sided and tendentious manner, leading the reader easily to conclusions about the "impossibility of peaceful co-existence" between socialist and capitalist countries, the "elusiveness" of detente in international relations, and the "instability" of agreements and treaties with the Soviet Union. In their present state, many chapters of the textbooks will not give American teachers and school children the correct idea of the complexities and laws of development of today's world, but will foment enmity and distrust towards the Soviet Union. It is our profound conviction that this does not meet the interests of the Soviet and American people.

PART II. PRE-SOVIET PERIOD

By and large, American textbooks under review give little space to the pre-Soviet period of the history of the USSR as compared with other periods. One gains the impression that these sections were needed only to corroborate the above-mentioned erroneous views of Soviet reality and foreign policy.

1. The textbooks employ an oversimplified black-and-white contrast between the history of Russia and that of the "West." The former is regarded as a product of the tsars' activity and the actions of the autocracy created by them and the latter as a result of popular democratic activity. A sufficiently informed and more objective presentation appears only in the texts describing the natural resources of the USSR and giving its economic and geographic characteristics.

2. The social and economic nature of the body politic of Rus - Great Russia - Russia and its age-long evolution are not analyzed. Matters are just limited to the conclusion that Russia has no traditions of emancipatory, revolutionary or culture-making activity and that all of its achievements stem from the westernization started by Peter the Great. In short, and in this way, the authors do not go much beyond the notorious Eastern world student, Keller, with his opus "East Minus West = zero."

3. This leads the authors to their chief aim -- a judgment of the Soviet period as an arbitrary revolutionary upheaval

engineered by fanatic communists that compelled the vast masses of the peoples of the USSR, at the price of unbelievable suffering, to serve the state in the name of industrialization, collectivization and the triumph of authoritarian and totalitarian principles.

4. Nothing is said about the role of the people in the national-liberation wars of Russia; moreover, the textbooks draw no distinction between the reunion with Russia of its ancestral lands seized by other countries and the expansion by tsarism of its possessions beyond their boundaries.

5. It is obvious that the authors are interested not so much in elucidating the history of Russia as in fostering among American high school students a feeling of distrust and hostility towards the USSR. Explaining the origins of the victory of the communists within the framework of the traditional conception of "modernization," the authors proceed from the thesis of Russia as a socially, economically and politically "underdeveloped state" and illustrate this by contrasting the 19th century Russia and North America. Some textbooks assert that Russia always lagged behind. Yet it is well known that Russia's backwardness was not so marked and that it belonged to the group of medium-developed countries. And in the second half of the 18th century Russia produced more iron than any other country in the world. This

was convincingly demonstrated long ago both in pre-revolutionary and in Soviet literature.[1]

6. Replacing the comparison of Russia and America with an elucidation of the history of their mutual relations on the basis of research published both in the USSR and USA would be more fair. It should be recalled how George Washington greeted the policy of neutrality announced by Russia and how the USA celebrated Russia's victory in the Patriotic War of 1812 (in most of the textbooks it receives no mention at all, while some say that the Russians retreated without battle into the interior of the country and that later Napoleon's army perished from frosts). The fact established by Soviet historians that a great portion of the invading troops was destroyed in battle before the onset of frosts did not interest the authors because this presentation would not have fit their image of savage Russia, hostile to all countries of Europe. It would seem appropriate also to recall the propagation by progressives in Russia of the experience of the American Revolution, the high appraisal given by American scientists of the achievements of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the establishment of diplomatic relations between Russia and North America. The American textbooks, in our view, do not pay sufficient attention to good relations between

---

[1]Cf. S. G. Strumilin, The History of Ferrous Metallurgy in the USSR, Vol. I, Moscow, 1954, and others.

Russia and America during the War of Independence (Russia's armed neutrality), during the Civil War in the USA (1863), and during World War I. Of course, such honest coverage of the past as it really was will call for a drastic revision of the fables filling these textbooks.

7. The problems of the history of Russia in the period of capitalism (1861-1917) receive scant treatment in the American textbooks. But even at this, the theoretical premises and the interpretation of individual facts of Russian history cannot but cause a feeling of protest. The textbooks openly assign to Western countries the role of the leader in world history and in effect refuse the rest of the world an independent historical development.

The authors of the textbooks offer an antiquated view of Russian society and allege that the unity of the country was only maintained by the autocratic power of the tsars. These arguments bring to mind the writings of the extreme right-wing publicists of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

One should also point to the utterly one-sided description of the Russian peasants as backward, ignorant, cruel, firmly tied to age-old traditions and hostile to any change. It is stressed that because of the communal ownership of the land the bulk of the Russian population never learned the sense of individual worth that follows from individual responsibility for

the care of property. It must be stated that work was always the determining factor of intra-commune relations. And the sense of individual worth for the Russian peasant stemmed from his right to work, guaranteed by the commune. The commune peasantry was not hostile to the necessary changes and requirements of the time. Of course, the development of peasant agriculture proceeded very slowly, but one should take into consideration the heavy burden of taxes and semi-bondage exploitation by the landowners. Incidentally, this last-mentioned feature is totally omitted in the textbooks.[1]

The coverage of the history of the first Russian revolution in the textbooks is very superficial and tendentious. Loyalty to false conceptions here goes hand in hand with an obvious and deliberate attempt to play down the historical significance of the first Russian revolution. Many studies by Soviet researchers are devoted to the history of the first Russian revolution and, if they had the desire, the authors could have acquainted themseleves with them. The importance of that revolution was duly appreciated in America too. In the days of revolutionary battles in Russia, Danel de Leon, a prominent American socialist, wrote

---

[1] On Russian village communes see I. D. Kovalchenko,"V. I. Lenin on the Character of the Agrarian System of Capitalist Russia -- Voprosy Istorii, 1970, No. 3, V. P. Danilov, "The Nature and Role of the Peasant Village Commune in Russia," in the book: Problem of the Social and Economic History of Russia, Moscow, 1971. L. N. Zyryanov, Some Features of the Evolution of Peasant Village Communes in the Post-Reform Epoch -- Yearbook on the Agrarian History of Eastern Europe, Vilnius, 1974.

that the impact of these events had touched every state in Europe; it had crossed the Atlantic and in all its formidable importance reverberated in America.[1]

The interpretation of some other facts -- Stolypin's land reform, the course of World War I, etc. -- also prompts objections. Generally speaking, the textbooks give too one-sided and biased an elucidation of the history of Russia in the capitalist period. This period is given too little space even as compared with the time of feudal rule. We can only regard this fact as the authors' attempt to avoid analyzing the objective social, economic, and political conditions that led to the October Socialist Revolution, prepared by the entire course of the country's development.

---

[1] J. D. Leon, Russia in Revolution, New York, 1927, p. 24.

PART III. GEOGRAPHY OF THE USSR.

Although geography is not studied in American schools as an independent subject, a number of textbooks in the world geography series give a more or less detailed and systematic account of the problems of the physical and economic geography of the USSR. Geographic descriptions in different textbooks are similar as a rule, which makes it easier to summarize the critical analysis of the textbooks.

1. To begin with, the general level of the overwhelming majority of textbooks, from the point of view of geographic science, is surprisingly low. They contain almost exclusively descriptive and factual material, more often than not generalized and simplified as much as possible. As a rule this material supplies answers to the most elementary questions, such as where, what and how much. Scientific terminology is rather weak, although many of the textbooks are intended for older school children.

These remarks apply to physical, economic and social geography alike. For instance, the authors of the American textbooks use very rarely, if at all, such important general ideas of economic and social geography as the notions of the world economy, the international geographic division of labor, economic integration, the scientific and technological revolu-

tion and its impact on the sectoral and territorial economic structure, economic zoning and the like. The textbooks virtually never mention major geographic ideas and concepts, schools of thought, or individual eminent geographers.

This approach shows in characterizing all countries, of course, but is particularly noticeable when it comes to the Soviet Union. Geographic science is rather highly developed in the USSR. From a descriptive science it is increasingly evolving into a constructive and transforming one that has close links with the practice of the socialist national economy. The achievements of Soviet scientists are well known to the world geographical community; in particular, these achievements were analyzed in detail at the 23rd International Geographic Congress in Moscow in 1976.

Against this background the parts of the American school textbooks dealing with the geography of the USSR look weak and sometimes downright hopeless from the point of view of theory. One gets the idea that their authors are amateurs engaged in superficial compilation and having a poor understanding of the problems under consideration, rather than specialists in the field. This is the most generalized, basic observation, which might explain the other, more specific shortcomings of the American textbooks.

2. The Soviet geographers do not share the ideas of the American authors regarding the typology and classification of

countries in today's world and the place of the Soviet Union in this classification. What we have here is an attempt to deny altogether the notion of a capitalist or a socialist country. For instance, some of the textbooks subdivide the world into countries belonging to the "free world," communist and non-aligned ones. This general subdivision is usually followed by the further breaking down of countries into the so-called cultural regions. So, the Soviet Union forms one such "culture region," or forms one together with the European socialist countries.

We can hardly agree with this classification because the notion of a cultural region is vague, amorphous and devoid of political and class content. That is why it is not used in Soviet geographic science.

It should be mentioned that the American textbooks give much space to geopolitical concepts, which manifest themselves even in the very names of "culture regions." For instance, the region of the USSR and European socialist countries is termed by some of the analyzed textbooks as the "heartland of Eurasia" along the lines of the geopolitical ideas of MacKinder that have more than once been sharply and deservedly criticized in the USSR. It is strange that such obsolete ideas are fed to American school children in the mid-1970's. The authors of the textbooks cannot fail to be aware that these ideas were produced

above all to justify territorial conquests and that their spirit absolutely contravenes the understandings reached at the Helsinki Conference.

3. Judging by the American textbooks, all of their authors, to a greater or smaller degree, profess geographic determinism, or, in other words, the unjustified exaggeration of the role played by the natural environment in societal life. Soviet geography rejects the concepts of geographic determinism (vulgar geographism) which play down the importance of social factors, the peculiar features of historical progress, and so on. This is particularly true of determinist opinions and conclusions as regards the Soviet Union, and there are quite a few of them in the American textbooks.

In describing the economic growth of the USSR, the American authors explain it, above all, by favorable natural conditions -- the abundance of mineral, land and other resources in our country -- almost completely overlooking the social and economic factors that are decisive in the development of a country, including the rational use of its natural reserves. The role of the climatic factor and its influence on the economy and even on societal life is especially overestimated. For instance, all textbooks represent the USSR as a country of eternal cold whose obviously exaggerated frost is a major obstacle to economic and social progress. Sometimes the authors even try

to "justify" by climatic constraints some of the difficulties encountered by the Soviet economy.

Certain textbooks lay particular stress on the "inaccessibility" of Soviet territory due to natural causes, such as Arctic seas and high mountains. This gives them the basis to defend political conclusions about the isolation of the USSR. This is being said about a country that trades with 113 states, maintains economic and technical cooperation with 78 nations, and is linked by scheduled flights with 70. In this way the determinist conceptions of the American authors are directly linked with geopolitical ones. As a result, American school children are likely to form a largely erroneous idea of the geographic situation and natural conditions of the USSR; these are then compared with the location and natural conditions of the USA with the obvious purpose of demonstrating the latter's "superiority."

4. The majority of the American textbooks offer insufficient and ideosyncratic treatments of individual sectors of the Soviet national economy. Sometimes certain key industries are ignored altogether. In other instances the material is arranged so as to deliberately distort the real situation. For example, many textbooks describe at length the growth of Soviet heavy industry and the achievements in the industrialization of the country. However, only the extracting industry (coal, oil and iron ore mining, etc.) and also iron and steel production are included as heavy industry. Such key sectors of the scientific and technolog-

ical revolution as engineering and chemicals are not described at all. This approach distorts beyond recognition the present level and structure of Soviet industry.

It is common knowledge that in 1977 the gross output of Soviet industry was over 80 per cent of that of the USA and that the USSR was leading the USA by a fair margin in oil drilling, steel making, the production of mineral fertilizers, cement, cotton fabrics and many other commodities. It is second only to the USA in the production of electricity and the output of engineering and the chemicals industry. These statistics are to be found both in official Soviet statistical publications and in UN materials. It is desirable that the American textbooks make a fuller and more accurate use of these statistics than before.

5. In our view, problems of the economic zoning and regional development of the USSR, covered only poorly and, for the most part, erroneously in the US textbooks, deserve particular attention on the part of our American colleagues. At best they supply a list or maps of the constituent republics of the USSR and briefly characterize some of the industrial and agricultural areas (sometimes selected rather arbitrarily). There is virtually no mention of such notions as the economic region, the territorial-production complex or regional proportions and changes in them. No idea is given of the hierarchy of economic regions or even the

network of major economic districts (altogether 18 of them). Territorial planning, the constructive character of economic zoning in the USSR and the role played by geography in solving major applied economic problems are overlooked as well.

Whenever the authors of individual textbooks touch upon the problems of economic zoning and regional development in the USSR, they frequently make mistakes, both those of approach and those of fact. Instead of characterizing the system of economic regions as it exists under Soviet legislation, they try, for some unknown reason, to single out arbitrarily such regions. This approach is well exemplified by the attempt of certain authors to subdivide Soviet territory into major sub-regions. Soviet economic geography and regional economics also use such classification, but it is based on very different principles. Another mistake is a misinterpretation by the American authors of the principle of the comprehensive development of economic regions in the USSR. The comprehensive approach is understood by them as self-sufficiency and even autarchy of sorts. In reality, however, the basic economic function of any region is determined, above all, by its specialization on a countryside scale and in the international socialist division of labor complemented by the comprehensive development of the major elements of its economic structure.

Incidentally, these questions are not particularly complex nor little studied in Soviet geographic and economic literature.

Moreover, Soviet school children learn to employ the basic concepts and notions related to the economic zoning of the USSR as early as the 8th grade.

6. Most of the information supplied by the American textbooks on the economic geography of the USSR is very outdated. What we mean are not current changes, which indeed are difficult to follow, but major, fundamental shifts in the distribution of the country's productive forces and substantial changes in regional proportions. For instance, only a couple of textbooks mention the development of the virgin lands in western Siberia and Kazakhstan. All of the textbooks without exception point to the area between the Volga and the Urals as the main oil-producing region of the USSR, whereas this role has been assumed by major oil and gas fields in western Siberia, the development of which has for some time exerted considerable influence on the distribution of the productive forces in the Soviet Union. Only a few textbooks mention in passing the construction of the Baikal-Amur Mainline (BAN), justly referred to elsewhere as the project of the century. Naturally, these gaps largely detract from the general idea of the Soviet Union's level of development and the efforts taken by the Soviet state to distribute rationally the productive forces.

As a rule, many figures related to the population of the USSR, the union republics and particularly major cities, in-

dustrial and agricultural output, the length of oil and gas pipelines, etc., are also very outdated. Many textbooks do not supply statistics at all. This considerably reduces the informative and argumentative characteristics of the material offered and is a manifestation, as it were, of the simplistic approach mentioned above.

PART IV. SUMMARY -- RECOMMENDATIONS ON IMPROVEMENTS IN US HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY TEXTBOOKS

Proceeding from the general recommendations of the 18th UNESCO Session as regards the need for accuracy, originality and impartiality in presenting the historical development of the peoples and states, from the tasks of extending mutual understanding between the Soviet and American peoples, and from the above analysis of the American textbooks, the Soviet side has prepared a number of practical proposals on their improvement with a view to a long-term perspective of cooperation.

These proposals take account of the exchange of opinion between Soviet and American experts and are related to the more general questions on which the sides agreed the most. As for certain particular observations on individual textbooks, the Soviet side realizes that their actual implementation depends for the most part on the professional responsibility of the authors and the goodwill of the publishers who have received the reviews by Soviet experts.

1. A general recommendation is to increase the proportion of materials on Soviet history and geography in American textbooks. In making this proposal, viewed favorably by our American counterparts, we believe that its implementation is essential to the extension of Soviet-American cultural relations.

The Soviet side considers that the implementation of this proposal should not necessarily result in increasing the overall

volume of textbooks since a better balance of historical and geographical questions may be worked out in each textbook. In particular, the coverage of historical and political problems may be reduced in geography textbooks, and so on. In principle, it would seem desirable to draw a distinction between historical and geographical material in the American textbooks in general as it is done in Soviet curricula. This would help a comparative analysis of corresponding Soviet and American textbooks, the more rational presentation of material, and the preclusion of a number of pitfalls usually awaiting laymen.

Last but not least, the coverage of Soviet history could be increased by omitting information which is not historical fact as such, but which is used extensively by the American mass media.

2. The Soviet side believes that recommendations on terminology are rather important.

To begin with, our country should be called by its precise name: "Rus," "Russia," and "the Russian Empire" until October 1917; "Soviet Russia" till the end of 1922; and "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," "the Soviet Union," or "the USSR" in the latter period.

The term "communism" should not be used to characterize the Soviet political system at all stages of its development. Soviet society has not yet achieved communism. The essential

structure of socialism had been built in the USSR by 1937. A society of mature, developed socialism had been created by the early 1960's. Today the Soviet people are at the stage of the full-scale construction of communist society.

A correct understanding of both past and present evolution of Soviet society is impossible without the complete presentation of facts related to the character, motive forces, and significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

It is necessary to cite objective and accurate data to the effect that the October Revolution was the natural outcome of the entire preceding societal and economic development and that it was carried out by the people led by the Marxist-Leninist Party of the Bolsheviks. The textbooks should supply an accurate account of the objectives formulated by the Party, which was established in 1903, and also of the ways and means used to promote them in the course of the three Russian revolutions. Concrete data should be given on the dynamics, numerical strength, and social composition of the Bolshevik Party and on the growth of its influence on the eve of the October Revolution.

It seems essential to point out that the Bolsheviks were not opposed in principle to the multi-party system. Political pluralism was withering away gradually, naturally, as a result of the fact that, as the revolutionary process gathered momentum, all parties except the Bolsheviks were losing the support of the

working masses and disintegrating organizationally.

The victory of the Bolsheviks was linked with their gaining the upper hand in the Soviets. A description of the Soviets, which had emerged during the first Russian Revolution as bodies of direct democracy and which combined legislative and executive powers, seems essential both to explain the political mechanism of the victory of the Bolsheviks and to make clear to the children differences in the understanding of democracy in the USSR and the USA.

Emphasis should be laid on the fact that the Bolsheviks always favored a peaceful road for the development of the revolution and that the October Revolution virtually avoided bloodshed.

It is desirable to describe in detail, or even to cite, some of the early decrees of the Soviet government. School children should undoubtedly know that the revolution immediately dispossessed the landowners and established the system of land tenure based entirely on the wishes of the peasants. In the early period of its existence the socialist state proclaimed the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different political systems.

A textbook description of the October Revolution should include a presentation of the role played by Lenin, the leader of the Bolsheviks and the founder of the Soviet state.

4. The USSR is a multinational state of a new type, and this fact should be properly reflected in the textbooks. The USSR was established five years after the October Revolution as a result of the voluntary unification of the majority of the peoples inhabiting the former Russian Empire into a federative unit. The development of the multinational state was a long process, during which formerly backward peoples were evolving into nations and acquiring the status of a union or autonomous republic with proper delineation according to national and territorial principles. Mention should be made of the fact that many peoples went through genuine cultural renaissance as a result of the victory of the October Revolution. Visual aids could be used to illustrate the point.

5. The Soviet side believes that accuracy, a thorough presentation of the facts, a sober analysis of points of contention and areas of contact between countries and peoples in the past, and illustration of the relationships between the foreign and domestic policies of states are essential in describing various aspects of foreign policy.

The main aim of Soviet foreign policy is to ensure as favorable conditions as possible for building socialism and communism. It should be stressed that the Leninist peaceloving foreign policy course has nothing to do with Trotskyism denounced by the Party. This course has remained unchanged throughout the

existence of the Soviet state. The formulation of ambitious constructive tasks within the country objectively predetermined the peace initiatives which the Soviet state has been forwarding in the international arena since its inception (CF. the 1922 Genoa Conference); the self same domestic factors have always been decisive to the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

Socialism was built in the USSR during an exceptionally difficult international situation. It seems essential for the textbooks to supply a more comprehensive analysis of the causes of World War II and to show how the Soviet Union consistently advocated a system of collective security in Europe in the face of the growing threat of war posed by Nazism. There is a need for a well-balanced presentation of all of the foreign policy actions of the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and Britain and France, on the other, on the eve of World War II. Textbooks should stress in particular that the USSR concluded a non-aggression treaty with Germany in 1939 only after all of its attempts to reach agreement on an alliance with the Western powers had failed and after it had become clear that the Western states had no serious intention to conclude such an alliance.

It is necessary to supply all facts clearly indicating that all of the subsequent steps taken by the USSR, up to the moment when Nazi Germany attacked it (among them the armed conflict with Finland), were in no way aggressive actions but

were required by the need to strengthen the country's defenses.

6. World War II, unleashed by the Nazis, was a severe trial for all mankind. The burden of the war was carried by the Soviet people, who lost 20 million lives in it. Soviet experts believe it is fundamentally important to demonstrate the decisive role played by the USSR in defeating the main force of aggression, Nazi Germany.

Between 1941 and 1944, the main theatre of operations was at the Soviet-German front, where major battles at Moscow, Stalingrad and the Kursk Bulge were of primary importance to the outcome of the war. That is why it seems worthwhile to cite comparative statistics on the forces of the antagonists in various parts of the world and at various stages of the war, and also on the losses inflicted on the aggressor by the allies, in order to present objectively the character and course of combat operations.

It is likewise desirable to characterize in greater detail military cooperation between the USSR, the USA and Britain, and also the nature of American aid to the USSR. Accurate data should be supplied on Lend-Lease deliveries and on their share of the total volume of armaments available to the Soviet Union at various stages of the war. It is important to stress the Soviet Union's faithfulness to its commitments as an ally, including its prompt and timely entrance into the war with Japan.

Particular emphasis should be laid on the fact that during World War II the USSR and the USA were able to put aside their political and ideological differences and to work successfully as allies in the struggle against all the forces of aggression.

It seems necessary to illustrate the mission of liberation performed by the Soviet Army in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe and to show objective reasons for the growing prestige of the USSR and the socialist system in the post-war period.

7. The Soviet people believe that victory in their Great Patriotic War against Nazi Germany was due to the superiority of the socialist system and to the moral and political unity of the people led by the Communist Party. A sober, realistic and consistent analysis of the circumstances of the development and progress of the Soviet economy and of the Soviet democratic system in American textbooks is demanded by the times.

It is necessary to explain in detail that the socialist economic system is based on the public ownership of the means of production. In the Soviet Union it has evolved in two forms, namely, state property and collective farm-cooperative property. The state exercises the management of the socialist economy according to a plan, which ensures its crisis-free development, stable growth rates, universal employment and the steady rise of the living standards of the population. The working people have a direct role to play in the management of production

through trade unions and permanent production conferences. The socialization of agriculture and its problems and achievements should be described in detail. Appropriate statistics should be supplied and compared to data on the pre-revolutionary Russian economy in presenting all of this material.

The Soviet side attaches particular importance to the objective presentation of the social policy of the Soviet state with its emphasis on free education, health care, pensions, the scope of housing construction, taxation policies and the like.

It seems worthwhile to demonstrate that the Soviet political system not only differs from the American one, but represents a qualitatively new phenomenon in the development of the forms of democracy. The Soviet political system includes government and mass organizations: the Communist Party, the Soviet state, the broad-based organizations of the working people, that is, the trade unions, the Young Communist League, the intellectual unions, etc. All power in the centre and in localities belongs to the Soviets of People's Deputies.

It is necessary to emphasize that, as Soviet democracy developed and extended, there evolved a fundamentally new idea of the rights and freedoms of the individual based on the unity of personal and public interests and the rights and duties of citizens. Today the state not only proclaims human rights, but it also guarantees their observance by its entire policy.

The text of the new Soviet Constitution, adopted in 1977, should be used extensively to illustrate the nature of the Soviet political and social system.

8. The Soviet system differs from the social and economic system of pre-revolutionary Russia as much as, say, from the American one. That is why any parallel between the Russia of the tsars and landowners and the present-day Soviet state should be avoided.

The Western countries should not be set in opposition to Russia, nor should undue emphasis be laid on the backwardness of the latter when describing the history of the Russian state during the feudal and capitalist ages. The theory that Rus owed its emergence to the Normans has long been rejected by science and therefore should be dropped. It is necessary to demonstrate that Russia has always been an important and independent factor in European history and that it has made a remarkable contribution to the treasure-house of world culture.

Textbooks should emphasize the existence of erstwhile traditions of liberatory, revolutionary struggle against social injustice among the peoples inhabiting the Russian state. Textbooks should also mention the influence of the French and American revolutions on progressive Russian social thinking and the spread of the more advanced social theories of our times among the Russian public.

The Soviet side attaches particular importance to the detailed presentation of relations of friendship between Russia and the USA and to emphasis on the fact that there were no contradictions between the two countries for a long period of history.

9. The geography textbooks should present a more comprehensive, thorough, and up-to-date picture of the deployment of the productive forces in the USSR, and they should also try to demonstrate tangible progress achieved because of the state policy of advancing the formerly backward areas and eradicating regional disbalances between different parts of the country. Particular stress should be laid on the shift of the Soviet Union's productive forces to the east and on the development of the eastern areas which have for some time been the central element of Soviet regional development policy. While discussing the deployment of the productive forces in the USSR, the textbooks should give school children a more systematic idea of economic zoning in the Soviet Union and of major territorial production complexes that have been formed as a result of planned economic management, particularly during the Soviet ninth and tenth five-year periods.

10. Today major importance is being attached to the familiarization of school children with the main global problems facing mankind, such as energy, raw materials and food, and also

to the development in them of ideas and notions related to the problem of the interaction of society and nature; more emphasis should be laid on the need for environmental protection. The Soviet side believes, however, that the outdated geopolitical conceptions widely used by US authors and also the overestimation of them of the theories of geographical determinism (e.g. environmentalism) are leading those authors to a number of erroneous tenets and conclusions that should be substantially revised.

At the same time, geography textbooks should pay more attention to the problems of the development of the world economy as a whole and the two world economic systems, to the problems of the international geographic division of labor, to economic integration, to the impact of the scientific and technological revolution on the structure and deployment of production and to ecological problems, while at the same time emphasizing the role played by the USSR and the USA in the world economy today.

11. The Soviet side, like the American one, attaches much significance to discussions of the positive aspects of Soviet-American cooperation in the 1970's. It is important to stress efforts by the two countries to ensure military detente and to outline prospects for cooperation in such fields as space research, the progress of science, medicine, education,

culture and environmental protection, and also the rational use of natural resources for the advancement of all of mankind.

By and large, the Soviet side believes that, without overlooking contradictions between the ideologies, policies, and social systems of the two countries, history and geography textbooks today should concentrate attention on those aspects which can contribute to better understanding between the peoples of the USSR and the USA.

CHAPTER IV -- RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REVISION OF AMERICAN AND SOVIET TEXTBOOKS

Chapters II and III contain textbook criticisms generated by each team following their careful study of geography and history textbooks used in the other country. In Chapter II, the American team reported its judgments about Soviet textbooks; Chapter III contains Soviet commentary on American texts.

Both teams have paid close attention to the criticisms and suggestions contained in these chapters, in individual textbook reviews, and in general reports exchanged throughout the period of the project. In addition, each team conducted separate reviews of the textbooks used in its own country, in order to complement the reviews provided by the other side.

This chapter contains the recommendations each side wants to provide its own authors and publishers regarding the changes needed in textbooks. Thus, the American team has prepared suggestions for changes in American geography and history textbooks; the Soviet Commission has ideas for improving Soviet textbooks. The sections that follow provide the recommendations of each team, acting independently following a review of the evidence. The suggestions do not constitute joint recommendations based upon mutual agreement, because each side was free to use or ignore as much of the advice provided by the other side as it deemed appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING AMERICAN GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

The task of textbook revision faces some special constraints in the United States. In contrast to a great many countries, including the USSR, the United States does not have a centralized system of education in which a national ministry of education prepares or recommends a single textbook for each subject in the school curriculum. In the United States each school system is largely free to choose the textbooks it wants from the many sold by commercial publishers. Authors and publishers can write and print what they think best meets the needs of students and the requirements of the subject. All share a desire to produce balanced books of high quality and scholarly integrity that will succeed commercially.

Because there are many authors and publishers, each with his own idea of what kind of book is most needed, it is impossible to specify subject matter content that will appear in every textbook. The American working group in the US/USSR Textbook Study Project cannot impose its recommendations on textbook authors and publishers -- nor does it wish to do so. Nevertheless, we expect authors and publishers to give our recommendations the same serious consideration they now give those that originate with other groups. Our recommendations eschew any attempt to promote a single point of view or an orthodox interpretation.

There is great value in exposing students to diverse views and opinions on Russia, the USSR, and US-Soviet relations. However, whatever approach is used, the treatment should be balanced, correct, and exclude out-dated or distorted material.

The recommendations that follow are a result of a careful process that has extended over a three-year period. The recommendations are based upon the review of 25 American history and geography textbooks carried out by both Soviet and American scholar-reviewers. Each American book was read by several subject specialists. While the recommendations draw upon the suggestions offered by the Soviet reviewers, the American team reached its own conclusions; its final recommendations are neither bound by nor limited to the suggestions offered by members of the Soviet Textbook Commission.

The individual textbook reviews drew attention to two major categories of problems: those that affected individual textbooks and those that were shared by several textbooks. Detailed American and Soviet reviews of each American book included in the study have been sent to each publisher respectively. They can draw upon these reviews in planning future revisions of their textbooks. The recommendations that follow are based upon more general classes of problems that affected more than a single textbook. We are focusing on these in the hope that they will not only be useful for authors and editors in planning the future revisions of those 25 textbooks included in the study, but that they will also be helpful

to the authors and editors of the hundreds of textbooks that were not included in the study as well as those who are about to undertake the publication of wholly new textbooks.

While preparing these recommendations we were aware of two important factors that affect the publication of history and geography textbooks in the United States. The first is the problem of constraints on content coverage. Because the high school world history course attempts to cover all ages of mankind from ancient times to the present, and all civilizations, in a 36-week course, any world history textbook is bound to be superficial; there are severe limits in the space it can assign to any country. We also recognize that courses in American history will reasonably focus on national events and information about the United States. Thus, there are important limits on the amount of space that can be justifiably devoted to the USSR. Soviet textbooks face similar constraints in their treatment of the United States.

Secondly, it is also apparent that some American textbooks suffer more than others from the use of outdated information and perspectives. At times this is a result of efforts to keep in print, with occasional revisions, a book that was written many years before -- sometimes by an author who is no longer living. For example, some American books were written in the 1950's at the height of the "cold war"; despite revisions they continue to reflect that tone and perspective. Given the fact that publishers

seek to keep successful books in print and given the natural lag that occurs between the publication of new scholarly findings and the appearance of these conclusions in textbooks, it is not surprising that many American books suffer from a serious lag between what American scholars know about the Soviet Union and what is contained in school textbooks.

Despite the qualifications and constraints mentioned above, we believe that American history and geography textbooks can make changes that will improve the treatment accorded to the USSR in our textbooks. The recommendations are aimed at providing our youth with the most balanced, accurate, and up-to-date information and perspectives possible on the USSR and on US-Soviet relations.

General Recommendations

The American working group feels strongly that textbooks in both countries should avoid using inflammatory and emotional language concerning the other nation or people. Thus, American authors and publishers should employ words, phrases and descriptions that are nonpartisan and dispassionate and avoid terminology that is prejudicial and stereotyped. For example, it is both inaccurate and harmful for American books to characterize the whole Soviet system as based on "slave labor camps," to describe the Soviet peoples as "submissive," or to label all Soviet foreign policy as "aggressive" or "aimed at world domination." In Chapter II, we have indicated similar pejorative language about the United States

appearing in Soviet textbooks that we believe should be deleted.

Recommendations Concerning Geography Textbooks

1. The Soviet system for classifying economic regions in the USSR should be employed in American textbooks. These regions correspond to the Soviet views of the most realistic regional divisions of the USSR and much of the regional statistical information published by the Soviet Union is placed within this regional framework. Maps of these regions can be obtained from virtually any university text on the geography of the USSR. Because of the space limitations in American textbooks, a somewhat generalized version of the official Soviet regions combining the sub-regions of the center and the Ukraine might be appropriate.

2. The geopolitical approach to the analysis of the USSR should be de-emphasized. Although the "heartland theory" of MacKinder provides an interesting historical perspective to an understanding of Western views toward the Russian Empire and the USSR, this theory has so many shortcomings it can scarcely serve as a guide to an interpretation of the complexities of either the tsarist or Soviet experience. The frequent reference in the American texts to the hypothesis that tsarist and Soviet territorial expansion have been motivated by the search for warm water ports is both simplistic and unwarranted.

3. The geographic or environmental determinism evident in most American textbooks should be eliminated. The American text-

books seriously exaggerate the effects of climate on Soviet development by presenting a bleak picture of the effects of cold winters and permanently frozen soils. The overwhelming majority of the Soviet population lives in climates similar to those encountered in the 48-state component of the United States and a relatively small share of the Soviet population lives in the massive zone of sub-Arctic and tundra climates.

4. The treatment of Soviet agriculture should be improved. Some books exaggerate the role of the private sector and emphasize such problems as the turbulence of the collectivization era, the famines of the early 1930's, production shortfalls, and the recurrent need to import grain from the West. Infrequent reference is made to the substantial long-term increases in the output of most agricultural commodities, the impressive growth of investment in agriculture in the last 25 years, and major socioeconomic changes in the countryside, including increased real income, guaranteed minimum wages, augmented retirement benefits and the substantial growth of consumer-goods industries in villages. A more balanced treatment is required.

5. The treatment of Soviet population, resources, and regional development should use the most recent available data. Some authors have failed to utilize English translations of Soviet sources or recent Western literature on the USSR.

6. Textbook authors should refrain from focusing exclusively on the most unfavorable features of the Soviet Union and offering misleading comparisons that place the USSR in a distinctly disadvantageous position. For example, American texts frequently compare the Soviet and American levels of wages, purchasing power, and production of consumer durables, such as private automobiles and color television sets. Rarely cited are the free medical care and higher education, the low rents, and the high degree of job security in the USSR. A more balanced treatment of Soviet attainments as well as problems clearly is needed in many of these texts.

Recommendations Concerning History Books

Although the amount of space devoted to each subject will be less in textbooks on U.S. history than in those on world history, we believe that in general our history textbooks can improve in the way they treat the following twelve issues:

1. American textbooks should not explain the origins of the first Russian state (Rus') solely by the Normanist or Varangian theory (which argues that in the ninth century Slavic tribes along the Dnieper River requested Viking-like warriors from Scandinavia to come and rule over them). If that theory is introduced, authors should also indicate other explanations, including the outline of the early development of the Slavic peoples and of early state forms in Russia worked out by American and Soviet scholars.

2. American textbooks should describe some of the major developments and achievements of Russian and Soviet culture, especially in the 19th and 20th centuries, as well as the contribution of Russian and Soviet artists and writers to Western cultural history. Within space limitations American textbooks might especially take advantage in their illustrations of the rich accomplishments of the visual arts in Russia and the Soviet Union, from icon-painting through stage and costume design to modern graphics and typography. Special attention should be paid to achievements in science, writing, music, dance, and sports. While such nineteenth-century giants as Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky cannot be overlooked, revolutionary figures such as Gorky, Mayakovsky and Sholokhov should also be treated.

3. American authors should improve the treatment of the Russian Revolution now provided in most books. As a minimum, we suggest that authors indicate the long revolutionary tradition in Russia; the deep causes of social unrest and protest even before World War I; the profound disaffection with the tsarist regime that was the immediate reason for its collapse in March, 1917; the widespread revolutionary movement among workers, peasants, soldiers, sailors, and national minorities that led to the Bolshevik Party coming to power in the October Revolution in the fall of 1917; and the broad and continuing impact of the October Revolution on World War I, on all the European countries,

and on socialist and revolutionary movements throughout the world.

4. American textbooks should identify Lenin by his correct first name, Vladimir Ilyich. Nor should they refer to Lenin as a German agent. If American authors wish to point out that the Germans helped Lenin and other revolutionaries to return to Russia from Switzerland in April, 1917 and that the Germans indirectly supplied some funds to the Bolshevik Party in the summer of 1917, they should make clear that Lenin and the Bolshevik Party accepted such assistance to further their own purposes and not to work for or serve the Germans. Moreover, Lenin and the Bolsheviks accepted aid from many sources, including capitalists, but at all times worked to achieve the party's growth and revolutionary goals.

5. American textbooks should draw attention to the multi-national character of the Russian empire and of the Soviet Union. In particular, they should not use the term "Russians" to refer to the Soviet people and leaders. The textbooks should call the post-1917 state "Soviet Russia" between 1918 and 1922 and the USSR or the "Soviet Union" between 1922 and today.

6. American textbooks should indicate that a major objective of Soviet foreign policy between 1934 and 1938 was to develop collective security arrangements among European nations against the growing threat of fascism represented by the Nazis in Germany and Mussolini's government in Italy.

7. American textbooks should describe the major contribution of the Soviet armed forces and Soviet people in the war against Germany and its allies, 1941-1945, and in the eventual defeat of Hitler's forces. The textbooks should point out the heavy losses the Soviet armed forces and partisans inflicted on the enemy armies and the extraordinary sacrifices and suffering of the Soviet nation, including wartime losses of 20 million people and the devastation of much of the western part of the Soviet Union.

8. American textbooks should explain some of the complex factors that brought on the "cold war": not only American resentment at apparent Soviet violations of wartime agreements and American fears of the extension of Soviet power into Iran, Greece, Eastern Europe, and Western Europe but Soviet suspicion that the Western "capitalist" powers were trying to encircle the Soviet Union and Soviet determination to guarantee the security of the Soviet Union by making sure friendly "socialist" governments ruled in Eastern Europe and by preventing Western domination of a reunited Germany. It is particularly important that American authors make clear to students the mutual mistrust and suspicion that underlay the "cold war" and the vicious circle of action and reaction on both sides that resulted (much as in the arms race). Most often one side's moves were interpreted by the other as threatening and hostile, and the latter then reacted in ways which validated the fears and suspicion of the first party -- and so on. On both

sides serious misperceptions inflamed the situation.

9. When describing the social and governmental system of the Soviet Union, American textbooks should explain both the primacy of the Communist Party as stated in the Constitution and carried out in practice and the functions of the structure of Soviets, including the legislative work of the Supreme Soviet and its commissions, and the many responsibilities of republic, regional, city and local Soviets.

10. American authors should reassess the use of the term "totalitarianism" as applied to the Soviet Union. First, the "totalitarian" model, originally developed some twenty-five to thirty years ago, has always been an abstract paradigm and no actual social system could be expected fully to conform to it. Second, while the model was helpful in calling attention to certain features in social systems that depend heavily on broad commitment and considerable coercion, most social and political scientists have not found its continued use particularly effective in explaining social and political behavior and few continue to employ the concept of totalitarianism any longer. Third, if applied at all to the Soviet Union, the term fits only the height of the Stalinist era in the 1930's, the period of forced collectivism and the purges and the excesses associated with them; it should not be used to describe Soviet society since that time.

11. American textbooks should discuss the various efforts at cooperation between the Soviet and American governments in the

1970's while noting the difficulties which have hindered fulfillment of the policy of detente.

12. American textbooks should indicate to students the complexity of contemporary Soviet society and life. Too often American authors portray the Soviet system as rigid, monolithic, and static. The reality is more complicated than this, and, while not ignoring heavy-handed and oppressive features of the present system, American books need to point out areas in which considerable spontaneity and creativity exist, as well as the general cultural and social heterogeneity of the world's second largest industrial society. Interest groups exist in the Soviet Union and there is a degree of pluralism, though perhaps not so much as in the United States. Within the limits of a general orthodoxy, there are differences of opinion among average citizens, among scholars and officials, and even among political leaders. Moreover, Soviet society is constantly changing, and students need to be alerted to the implications of this.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING SOVIET GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

The Soviet side believes that joint work will be continued and will yield positive results because it is based on the mutual striving of the sides to fulfill to the fullest possible extent the recommendation of the 18th Session of the UNESCO General Conference (1974). The Project has demonstrated that both sides

are striving for accuracy, impartiality and good balance in the presentation of the historical development of the two countries and for conveying in the textbooks the ideas of peace, mutual understanding and cooperation among nations and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This is in full accord with the provisions of the fourth part of the Helsinki Final Act signed by the heads of our two states.

The Soviet history textbooks do not instigate animosity or hatred for other nations but are suffused with the idea of developing and extending international cooperation and peace among nations; they denounce inhuman ideas and practices of aggression, violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, fascism and neofascism, colonialism and neocolonialism, racism and its various forms (apartheid, genocide, Zionism, etc.), and also reflect the equality of the peoples and their right to self-determination. The Soviet textbooks illustrate societal progress, the development of the new, socialist world, and the complexity of historical progress in our age.

Soviet authors proceed from the Marxist-Leninist concept of world historical progress and take guidance from methodology adopted in our country. For this reason the Soviet commission does not think it is possible to submit for their consideration a number of remarks by American experts containing recommendations that cannot be accepted because of the difference in historical approach.

For instance, if the modern history Soviet textbook for the ninth grade emphasized, in its coverage of the USA in the 1920's, such aspects as the development of jazz, Charles Lindberg, prohibition, and the stock market boom, this would mean that the Soviet authors had lost their principled approach to history and had overlooked the social content of the historical process. The textbook would therefore lose its educational value and become an entertaining story about inconsequential things.

Neither can the Soviet side accept recommendations concerning the need to play down the role of the popular masses and public movements while enhancing the role of individuals, above all, presidents. It goes against our principles to summarily depict American workers as "hopelessly conservative" people. Neither can we agree to the assertion that tangible class distinctions that are typical of the other capitalist countries are not to be found in the USA.

Certain recommendations by US experts cannot be accepted for reasons of methodology. For example, a certain portion of their remarks are related to the textbook presentation of many new problems. For example, it is suggested that the US political system be described in greater detail and that the functioning of the Democratic and Republican Parties, the social composition of the electorate, the grassroot activities of the parties, and similar questions be outlined. To fulfill such recommendations

would require an increase in the volume of the corresponding chapters of the textbooks. As a result, material about other countries in the textbook would have to be re-arranged, which is a rather complex task; apart from that, the textbook must highlight major problems.

The American side should also bear in mind another circumstance. Many problems of US history and geography that are proposed for inclusion in the Soviet textbooks are expounded in specialist literature (e.g., teachers' guides and textbooks for higher schools) that are used by teachers on a large scale when they prepare for their classes.

While writing textbooks, Soviet authors try to use official sources, including statistics. We do not rule out the possibility that certain United Nations publications immediately related to history and geography problems under consideration might be used. The Soviet side suggests that the data published by the American press (e.g., Newsweek) not be used because the evidence shows that it reflects certain preconceptions (take, for instance, the Vienna summit and the signing of the SALT-II treaty).

A number of recommendations submitted by the American experts take no account of the curricula of other school courses in the USSR. For instance, it is proposed that certain aspects of the understandings reached at Helsinki be illustrated more extensively. It should be pointed out that the Helsinki accords

have been published in mass editions and in the Soviet press, that they are law for this country, and that their provisions have been written into the Soviet Constitution and are being studied within such courses as "The Fundamentals of the Soviet State and Legislation" (grade eight) and "Social Sciences" (grade ten).

Certain remarks by US experts are of secondary importance because they merely urge greater precision. The authors of the remarks themselves point out that the Soviet textbooks objectively appraise historical facts and events. This concerns, in particular, the "non-intervention" policy which objectively facilitated the aggression of Germany, Italy and Japan just like the policy of "neutrality" pursued by other countries.

Certain remarks by the American side are caused by a misinterpretation of the content of the textbooks. The Soviet modern history textbook for the tenth grade does not say that Lend-Lease was a result of the action of the popular masses and that the anti-fascist coalition was established thanks to Lenin's instructions. The authors of the remarks also misinterpreted the contemporary history textbook, which designates as "proletarians" hired labor in agriculture as well as industrial workers, etc.

Some of the suggestions by US experts are prompted by their desire to make certain facts more precise and to eliminate inaccuracies. Certain proposals are caused by the desire not so much to change essentially correct premises as to complement and

extend them.

Bearing in mind the need to achieve the utmost possible scientific objectivity and authenticity, the Soviet Commission considers it possible to recommend that Soviet authors take account of the suggestions that follow.*

"Modern History," Part I: Textbook for the 8th Grade of Secondary School

To make a number of premises more accurate, among them those on the role of the British aristocracy and parliament in US history, on the American boycott of British goods, on the specific features of the "Boston massacre," the course of the Shays's rebellion, the blacks' participation in the war of independence, etc.

To supply a more accurate description of the origins, character and motive forces of the eighteenth century North American revolution and its consequences.

To edit the texts concerning the work of the US Supreme Court and US policy vis-a-vis Panama with due account for the chronological framework of the textbook.

---

*Ed. note. The reader may not always comprehend Soviet suggestions from this point forward, as they are linked directly to comments that appear in the American reviews of Soviet textbooks sent to the Ministry of Education in March, 1979. Some of the recommendations are meaningless without having had an opportunity to read the reviews. In negotiating a final report, members of the Soviet team will be asked to elaborate on these recommendations so that they will hold greater meaning to those without access to the textbook reviews on which they are based.

To pay more attention to the problems and character of the abolitionist movement.

To review the description of the assassination of Lincoln and the position of Great Britain as regards the Civil War.

To supply a more accurate description of the post Civil War amendments to the Constitution on the rights of black people and also of the period of the colonization of the West.

"Modern History," Part II: Textbook for the Ninth Grade of Secondary School

To describe in greater detail the complex social and class structure of American society and the character and role of progressivism and reformism in the USA in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries.

To demonstrate the role of immigration in the formation and development of the American nation and in the social and political history of the United States.

To give a broader coverage of various social movements of a democratic nature (those of women, young people, office workers, etc.).

To supply a more accurate time frame for the economic crisis and recession in the USA in the late nineteenth-early twentieth centuries, the dates of presidential terms, the date on which the USA signed a treaty with Korea, and the size of the US foreign debt in 1914.

To supply a more accurate description of the influence of monopolies in the American economy and political system.

"Contemporary History" (1917-1939): Textbook for the Ninth Grade of Secondary School, and "Contemporary History" (1939-1976): Textbook for the Tenth Grade of Secondary School

To describe in greater detail the normalization of Soviet-American relations in 1933, the development of Soviet-American trade in the 1920's, the peace and disarmament movement in the USA, and the striving of many Americans for greater social and economic justice.

To provide more accurate data on the losses of the American Navy as a result of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, to specify the provisions relating to the export of US strategic materials to Japan, the US attitude to Austria's 1938 Anschluss with Germany, and the responsibility of a certain portion of the officialdom for the passing of the neutrality bill.

"History of the USSR": Textbook for the Ninth Grade of Secondary School

To devote more space to Soviet-American economic relations in the 1920's.

To describe in greater detail reasons for the allies' intervention in the Far East after World War I in view of American-Japanese rivalry in the region.

"History of the USSR": Textbook for the Tenth Grade of Secondary School

To describe more comprehensively US participation in the Pacific war and America's contribution to the defeat of militarist Japan, using for this purpose the contemporary history textbook.

To edit the description of the political regime installed by Japan in the occupied Philippines and on the account of actual violation by Japan of the neutrality treaty.

To specify which Geneva Conference is referred to in the textbook: the Soviet-American-British-French summit in the summer of 1955 or the foreign ministers' conference in April 1954.

"Economic Geography of Foreign Countries": Textbook for the Ninth Grade of Secondary School

To extend the presentation of the theoretical principles of geography as a science and also the description of modern methods of geographic research.

To pay more attention to the problems of economic cooperation between the USSR and the USA.

To show the consequences of the intervention of human society in natural processes, employing examples from socialist countries as well as from capitalist ones.

To specify certain factual data, namely, those regarding poverty levels in the USA, the employment of the black population in Washington, the ownership of motor roads, etc.

To make better use of United Nations publications in supplying statistical information.

"Geography of Continents": Textbook for the Sixth Grade

To supply more accurate information concerning the climatic regions of the USA.

To characterize more comprehensively the US population and to update factual information on the status of the minorities.

To better characterize the global problems of man's relationship with the environment.

To take account of certain editorial comments contributing towards the elimination of factual errors

The authors of the Soviet textbooks, assisted by scientists, are systematically working to improve their contents and to raise the scientific and educational value of the textbooks with due regard for the achievements of Soviet and American science. New history textbooks for the eighth to tenth grades will be completed in the near future.

For instance, a new textbook, to replace the one by A. V. Yefimov, has already been submitted to the publishers. Its contents, organized in keeping with the existing history course for the eighth grade, will reflect the suggestions of the Soviet and American historians participating in this project. The authors of the textbook carefully analyzed all of the materials provided for the Soviet-American symposium on textbooks that took place in Moscow in June 1979. As a result, the scientific and educational level of the textbook has been improved. The authors

have taken account of and fulfilled to the greatest possible extent most of the remarks of the US experts as regards specific historical facts, errors, more comprehensive descriptions, etc.

In conclusion we believe it necessary to point out that the contents of Soviet textbooks are the responsibility of their authors. Following the approval of the manuscripts by scientists, the Ministry of Public Education examines them from the point of view of correspondence to the existing curricula and methodology. These circumstances draw attention to the special importance of continuing the successful work of Soviet and American experts.

CHAPTER V -- CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

> "The question is not whether we are perfectly agreed, but whether we are proceeding from a common basis of sentiment." Goethe

It should be apparent from the reports contained in Chapters II, III, and IV that the American working group and the Soviet Textbook Commission were not "perfectly agreed." Each found much to criticize in the history and geography textbooks used in the other country; neither accepted all of the criticisms offered by the other. We must assume that while significant changes can be made in the textbooks of each country based upon the work of this project, neither side will be fully satisfied with the final results.

But if the American and Soviet teams were not always "perfectly agreed," they did proceed "from a common basis of sentiment." They launched the project with the shared belief that textbooks are important because what children are taught about their own country, about other countries, and about the relationships between countries can ultimately affect the international behavior of nations. More than three years of work strengthened this opinion. Indeed, the review of textbooks and recent world events have dramatized the importance of the textbook project. The need for better understanding has rarely seemed more urgent.

But members of the American and Soviet teams shared more than "sentiment." Running through their reports are similar criticisms of textbooks of both countries and recommendations for ways they might be improved.

Criticisms. These are a few of the ways in which books in the two nations can be judged similarly deficient:

1. Both American and Soviet textbooks tend to glorify the accomplishments of their own nation and to denigrate the contributions of others. Confronted with similar behavior by leaders in the two nations, textbooks tend to attribute worthy motives to their own country's leaders and base motives to the leaders of the other nation.
2. Both American and Soviet textbooks feature the least attractive aspects of life in the other nation. When comparisons are offered between the two countries, textbook authors tend to emphasize the strengths of their own country and the weaknesses of the other society.
3. Textbooks in both countries tend to emphasize political affairs and devote scant attention to social and cultural life in the other country.
4. Textbooks in both countries tend to be written from a Cold War perspective. The intention appears to be one

of helping students understand a dangerous rival for world leadership. Textbook content that focuses on relationships between the United States and the USSR tends to dwell on the most unpleasant experiences. Even treatments of collaboration during World War II usually fail to award the other nation the credit it deserves.

Recommendations. In addition to eliminating the deficiencies cited above, textbook authors in both countries can profit from the following recommendations:

1. When treating a topic involving a dispute between the United States and the USSR, authors should include information about how the issue is interpreted in the other country. Students cannot reach a completely fair and objective understanding of the situation if they have only the views expressed by their own national leaders. They should have an opportunity to consider the arguments raised by the leaders of the other country as well.
2. Authors should strive to use the most accurate up-to-date information. Too frequently authors fail to take advantage of recent data published by the other country or information available from international agencies such as the United Nations.

3. When discussing disputes that have arisen over violations of treaties and other agreements, textbook authors should provide the texts of the relevant portions of agreements in their textbooks in order that students can judge for themselves the extent of violations that has occurred.
4. Authors should avoid the use of emotional and pejorative language in discussing the people, leaders, and policies of the other side.
5. Regardless of the differences in their economic systems, the political rivalry, and the ideology that separates the two nations, authors should encourage feelings of respect for the national traditions and customs of the other country and promote a desire for peace, cooperation, and mutual understanding between the peoples of the two countries.
6. Authors should use opportunities in textbooks to point out that solutions to many social, economic, and environmental problems confronting nations today require multi-national collaboration.

Suggestions for Future Activities

The successful review of textbooks and the degree of cooperation achieved by the American and Soviet experts have drawn attention to the need for and the possibility of further collabora-

tion. The way in which the work can be best conducted, who should be responsible, and the specific long-range objectives have not been resolved. Nevertheless, all agreed that a number of future activities were desirable. Some examples of future collaboration are:

1. Joint efforts to implement the recommendations contained in the final report. When it becomes possible to complete a final report, it should be disseminated broadly in each country. Efforts at implementing its recommendations might include presentations at professional meetings of authors, editors, and teachers in each nation. (For example, three members of the Soviet Textbook Commission attended the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Portland, Oregon in November, 1979. At this meeting they had an opportunity to speak to textbook authors, editors, and teachers about their criticisms of American textbooks.)
2. Seminars for Textbook Authors and Editors. The two sides might agree to sponsor an annual seminar that in one year might be a joint meeting of textbook editors, in another year a joint meeting of authors of history textbooks, and in another year the authors of geography texts. The seminars could take advantage of the textbook analyses produced by this project and promote

discussion of history or geography topics that deserve special attention.

3. Scholarly Seminars on History and Geography Topics

The textbook treatment of some history and geography topics -- such as the origins of the Cold War -- cannot be improved without advances in the understanding of experts on these topics. Meetings between research scholars on key historical and geographical topics should be encouraged.

4. Joint Research on Student Knowledge and Attitudes toward the Other Nation. Assumptions about what Soviet students know and believe about the United States and what American students know and believe about the Soviet Union rest on very little evidence. The textbook project has been based upon the premise that students' knowledge and attitudes are inadequate, depend upon textbooks, and should be improved. Joint research aimed at acquiring evidence of what youth in the two nations actually know about the other is essential.

5. Further Exchange of Textbooks and Other Teaching Aids. The two sides should devise means to keep experts in the two nations fully abreast of changes that occur in textbooks. One way to accomplish this task is to provide for the regular and systematic exchange of textbooks and other teaching aids.

6. Further Textbook Studies. This project focused solely on school history and geography textbooks. It would be useful to undertake new studies that include other school subjects, films and other teaching aids that accompany textbooks, and textbooks at other levels of formal education, for example, history and geography textbooks used in colleges and universities.

Beyond these specific suggestions, members of the Soviet and American teams are convinced that educational and cultural exchanges between the United States and the USSR are an essential part of building a peaceful world. Both sides should encourage further contacts among American and Soviet students, teachers, and scholars.

APPENDIX A

Lists of American and Soviet Textbooks Included in the Study

LIST OF AMERICAN GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

Grade 7 World Geography/World Studies

1. Cuban. Soviet Union: Spectra Series. Scott-Foresman
2. Drummond. Our World Today: Eastern Hemisphere. Allyn and Bacon
3. Kimball. This is Our World. Silver Burdett
4. Preston. Culture Regions in the Eastern Hemisphere. D. C. Heath
5. Ver Steeg. World Cultures. Scott-Foresman

Grade 9/10 World Geography

1. Association of American Geographers. Geography in an Urban Age. Macmillan
2. James. The Wide World: A Geography. Macmillan
3. Jones. Geography and World Affairs. Rand McNally
4. Kolevzon. Our World and Its People. Allyn and Bacon
5. Newhill. Exploring World Cultures. Ginn

Grade 10 World History

1. McNeil. The Ecumene: Story of Humanity. Harper and Row
2. Perry. Man's Unfinished Journey. Houghton Mifflin
3. Shrier. History and Life. Scott-Foresman
4. Stavrianos. A Global History of Man. Allyn and Bacon
5. Thompson. People and Civilizations. Ginn

Grade 8 American History

1. Brown. Let Freedom Ring. Silver Burdett
2. Eibling. Two Centuries of Progress. Laidlaw
3. Graff. The Free and the Brave. Rand McNally
4. Risinger. America! America! Scott-Foresman
5. Wilder. This is America's Story. Houghton Mifflin

Grade 11 American History

1. Bragdon and McCutcheon. History of a Free People. Macmillan
2. Schafer. United States History for High Schools. Laidlaw
3. Shenton. These United States. Houghton Mifflin
4. Ver Steeg. A People and a Nation. Harper and Row
5. Wiltz. Search for Identity: Modern American History. Lippincott

LIST OF SOVIET GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

Grade 6 Physical Geography

V. A. Korinskaia, L. D. Prozorov, and P. N. Schastnev. Geografia Materikov /Geography of the Continents/ 1976

Grade 9 Economic Geography

V. P. Maksakovsky, ed. Ekonomicheskaia Geografia Zarubezhnikh Stran. /Economic Geography of Foreign Countries/ 1976

Grade 8 World History

A. V. Efimov. Novaia Istoriia /Modern History/ 1976

Grade 9 World History

V. M. Khvostov, ed. Novaia Istoriia /Modern History/ 1977

V. K. Furaev. Noveishaia Istoriia (1917-1939) /Contemporary History (1917-1939)/ 1977

Grade 10 World History

V. K. Furaev. Noveishaia Istoriia (1939-76) /Contemporary History (1939-76)/ 1977

Grade 9 History of the USSR

I. B. Berkhin and I. A. Fedosov. Istoriia SSSR /History of the USSR/ 1976

Grade 10 History of the USSR

M. P. Kim. Istoriia SSSR (1938-1976) /History of the USSR (1938-1976)/ 1977

---

*All of the textbooks were published in Moscow by "Prosveshchenie."

APPENDIX B

Program for the Conference of American and Soviet Participants in the Textbook Study, Moscow, June, 1979

ПРОГРАММА

ПРОВЕДЕНИЯ РАСШИРЕННОГО ЗАСЕДАНИЯ
СОВЕТСКИХ И АМЕРИКАНСКИХ СПЕЦИАЛИСТОВ
ПО АНАЛИЗУ СОДЕРЖАНИЯ ШКОЛЬНЫХ
УЧЕБНИКОВ ИСТОРИИ И ГЕОГРАФИИ
17 ИЮНЯ — 1 ИЮЛЯ 1979
Июнь 1979 года

ITINERARY

FOR THE ENLARGED SESSION OF SOVIET
AND AMERICAN SPECIALISTS
ON THE ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS
OF TEXTBOOKS IN HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY
JUNE 17 - JULY, 1979

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

17 июня

(воскресенье)

— Прибытие делегации американских специалистов в Москву, аэропорт «Шереметьево», встреча, размещение в гостинице («Пекин»)

18 июня

(понедельник)

9.30—10.30 — Беседа в Министерстве просвещения СССР с руководством американской делегации.

11.00—13.00 (Конференц-зал Совета Советских Обществ Дружбы) — Первое рабочее заседание советских и американских специалистов (Председательствует — А. Л. Нарочницкий)

— Вступительное слово Председателей советской и американской комиссий.

— «Анализ американских школьных учебников в части изложения в них истории и географии СССР». (Академик АН СССР Нарочницкий А. Л.).

— Обзор анализа советских учебников истории и географии. (Доклад представителя американской рабочей группы).

JUNE 17

(Sunday)

— Arrival of the delegation of the American specialists at the Sheremetyevo airport, meeting of the delegation, accomodation in the hotel "Peking".

JUNE 18

(Monday)

9.30—10.30 — Meeting at the Ministry of Education of the USSR.

11.00—13.00 (Conference-hall of the Council of Soviet Friendship societies) — First working session of the American and Soviet specialists. (Chairman A. L. Narotchnitsky)

— Introductoly speech of the Chairmen of the Soviet and American Commissions.

— "Analysis of American textbooks with the special reference to the history and geography of the USSR". (Academician of Academy of Sciences of the USSR Narotchnitsky A. L.)

— Survey of the analysis of Soviet textbooks in history and geography. (Report of a representative of the American working group).

13.00—15.00 — Перерыв на обед

15.00—19.00 (Конференц-зал СОДа)
— Второе рабочее заседание советских и американских специалистов (Председательствует Х. Мелиндер)
— Ответные выступления авторов советских учебников и членов советской делегации на замечания американских экспертов и специалистов (выступления авторов учебников по истории и географии — Аверьянов А. П., Беркин А. Б., Ким М. П., Фураев В. К., Федосов И. А., Мясковский В. П. Выступления членов делегации — Иванов Р. Ф., Пашуто В. Т. и Севастьянов Г. Н.)
— Отчетные выступления американских экспертов и специалистов по представленному обзору анализа американских школьных учебников истории и географии

13.00—15.00 Lunch time

15.00—19.00 (Conference Hall of the Council of Soviet Friendship Societies)
— Second working session of the Soviet and American specialists (Chairman H. Melinger)
— Responses of the authors of Soviet textbooks and members of the Soviet delegation to comments of the American experts and specialists (the authors of the textbooks in history and geography — Averjanov A. P., Berkin A. B., Kim M. P., Fraev V. K., Fedosov I. A., Maksakovsky V. P., members of the delegation Ivanov R. F., Pashuto V. T., Sevastjanov G. N.)
— Responses of the American experts and specialists to the presented survey of the analysis of American textbooks on history and geography

19 июня

(вторник)

— Свободный день.

19.00 — Посещение Кремлевского Дворца Съездов. Балет «Ромео и Джульетта» в исполнении артистов Киевского театра оперы и балета.

20 июня

(среда)

— Экскурсия в Ясную Поляну. Посещение Дома-музея Л. Н. Толстого.

JUNE 19

(Tuesday)

— Free Day.

19.00 — The Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Ballet "Romeo and Juliet" Kiev Opera & Ballet Theatre.

JUNE 20

(Wednesday)

— Excursion to Yasnaya Poliana. Visit to the house--museum of L. N. Tolstoy.

21 июня

(четверг)

9.30 — 13.00
(Зал заседаний Президиума Академии педагогических наук СССР)

— Третье рабочее заседание советских и американских специалистов. (Председательствует А. Е. Ширинский) Советско-американский симпозиум по отдельным проблемам содержания курсов истории и географии учебников двух стран.
— "Великая Октябрьская социалистическая революция и ее историческое значение". (Чл.-корр. АН СССР Ю. А. Поляков).
— "Американская революция и ее историческое значение". (Доклад представителя американской делегации).
— "Причины и характер Второй мировой войны. Роль СССР в разгроме фашистской Германии и ее сателлитов". (Чл.-корр. АН СССР Ю. С. Кукушкин).

JUNE 21

(Thursday)

9.30—13.00
(Conference Hall of the Presidium of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR)

— Third working session of the Soviet and American specialists. (Chairman A. E. Shirinsky).
— Soviet — American Simposium on special issues of the contents of textbooks in history and geography of both the countries.
— "The Great October Socialist Revolution and its Historical Significance". (Correspondent member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Ju. A. Poliakov).
— "The American Revolution and its Historical Significance". (Report of a representative of the American delegation).
— "Causes and Character of World War II. The Role of the USSR in the defeat of the nazi Germany and its satellites". (Corr. member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Ju. S. Kukushkin).

13.00—15.00 — Перерыв на обед

15.00 — 17.00 (Зал заседаний Президиума АПН СССР)
— Четвертое рабочее заседание советских и американских специалистов. Продолжение работы симпозиума (Председательствует член американской комиссии).
— «Военные действия на Тихом океане во Второй мировой войне (1937—1945 гг.)». (Доклад члена американской делегации)
— Общественно-политическое развитие США на современном этапе». (Доклад члена американской делегации).
— «Общественно-политическое развитие СССР на современном этапе». (Доктор исторических наук И. Б. Берхин)

13.00—15.00 Lunch time

15.00—17.00 (Conference-Hall of the Presidium of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR)
— Afternoon session. The fourth meeting of the Soviet and American specialists. (Chairman — a member of the American comission).
— "War in the Pacific in World War II". (Report of an American representative of the delegation).
— "Contemporary Social-Political Development of the United States". (Report of a member of the American delegation).
— "Contemporary Social-Political Development of the USSR". (Doctor of History I. B. Berkhin)

22 июня

(пятница)

9.30—13.00 — Пятое рабочее заседание советских и американских специалистов. Продолжение работы симпозиума. (Председательствует член американской комиссии)

— "Региональное развитие Соединенных Штатов". (Доклад члена американской делегации)

— "Проблемы экономического районирования и регионального развития СССР". (Доктор географических наук Макаровский В. П.)

— "Внешняя политика США по отношению к СССР на современном этапе". (Доклад члена американской делегации)

— "Советско-американские отношения на современном этапе". (Доктор исторических наук Иванян Э. А.)

(Conference hall of the Presidium of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR)

13.00—15.00 — Перерыв на обед

JUNE 22

(Friday)

9.30—13.00 — Fifth working session of the Soviet and American specialists. Continuation of the Symposium. (Chairman — a member of the American delegation)

— "Regional Development in the United States". (Report of a member of the American delegation)

— "Problems of economic districting and Regional Development of the USSR". (Dr. of Geography V. P. Makarovsky)

— "American Foreign Policy Toward the USSR During the 1970's". (Report of a member of the American delegation)

— "Contemporary Soviet American Relations." (Dr. of History E. A. Ivanyan)

13.00—15.00 — Lunch time

15.00—17.00
(Конференц-зал Союза Советских Обществ Дружбы)

— Продолжение работы заседания советских и американских специалистов. (Председательствует Ю. А. Поляков).
— Комментарии сторон по представленным докладам советских и американских специалистов, а также по рекомендациям к темам.
— Подведение итогов работы совместного заседания советских и американских специалистов, обсуждение тематического плана и порядка работы комиссии во время декабрьской встречи в США.

15.00—17.00
(Conference hall of the Council of the Union of the Soviet Friendship Societies)

— Afternoon session of the Soviet and American specialists (Chairman Ju. A. Polyakov).
— Reciprocal commentary on the presented reports of the Soviet and American specialists, recommendations to the themes.
— Summing up the results of the joint meetings and sessions of the Soviet and American specialists; discussion of plan of themes and the work of the comission at the meeting in December in the USA.

23—30 июня

— Выезд членов американской делегации по группам в города Киев, Ленинград, Ташкент и Самарканд. Работа в библиотеках г. Москвы одной группы.

Первая группа (3 человека) — Пребывание в Москве. Работа в библиотеках.

Вторая группа — Пребывание в г. Киеве (с 23 по 26 июня) и г. Ленинграде (с 26 по 30 июня).

Вылет из Москвы в Киев рейсом № 1781 23.06.79 в 15.20 (аэропорт «Внуково»).

Третья группа — Пребывание в городах Ташкенте (23—28 и 30 июня) и Самарканде (28—29 июня).

Вылет из Москвы в Ташкент 23.06.79 рейсом № 659 в 10.20 (аэропорт «Домодедово»).

На время пребывания членов делегации американских специалистов в городах Киеве, Ленинграде, Ташкенте и Самарканде предусматривается: встречи и беседы в Министерствах просвещения УССР, УзССР; ГУНО г. Ленинграда и в ГОРОНО г. Самарканда, посещение ЛГПИ им. А. И. Герцена, пединститутов в городах Киеве и Ташкенте; НИИ педагогики УССР, УзССР, Киевского, Ленинградского и Ташкентского университетов, а также ознакомление с музеями, историческими памятниками и другими достопримечательностями городов пребывания.

JUNE 23-30

— Visits of the American delegation to the cities of Kiev, Leningrad, Tashkent and Samarkand. Work at the Moscow libraries of one of the groups.

First group — Moscow libraries.

Second group — Kiev — (June 23-26), Leningrad (June 26-30). Departure from Moscow June 23, flight N-1781, 15.20, airport "Vnukovo".

Third group — Tashkent (June 23-28 and 30), Samarkand (June 28-29). Departure from Moscow June 23, flight N-659, 10.20, (airport Domodedovo).

During the visits of the members of the American delegation to Kiev, Leningrad, Tashkent and Samarkand the following meetings are arranged: the Ukrain. Ministry of Public Education, Ministry of Educatin of the Uzbek Republic, Department of Public Education in Leningrad and in Samarkand; Teacher's Training Institutes in Leingrad, Kiev, Tashkent, Research Institute of Pedagogy in the Ukrain and Uzbekistan Soviet Socialist Republics; Kiev, Leningrad and Tashkent Universities, museums, historical monuments and other places of interest in the above cities.

30 июня

(суббота)

— Прибытие второй и третьей групп в Москву.

а) из Ленинграда в 11.40 рейсом № 2418, а/порт «Шереметьево».

б) из Ташкента в 11.00 рейсом № 652, а/порт «Шереметьево».

1 июля

(воскресенье)

— Вылет членов американской делегации в США.

JUNE 30

(Saturday)

— Arrival in Moscow a) second group from Leningrad at 11.40, flight N-2418, airport "Sheremetyevo"; b) third group from Tashkent at 11.00, flight 652, airport "Sheremetyevo".

JULY 1

(Sunday)

Leaving for the USA.

APPENDIX C

Final Protocol for the Conference of American and Soviet Participants in the Textbook Study, Moscow, June, 1979

PROTOCOL
on the results of the meeting of Soviet and American specialists to analyze history and geography textbooks

From June 18 to 22, 1979, following extensive preparatory work, there took place in Moscow a meeting of representatives of the American and Soviet working groups on the analysis of history and geography textbooks published in the USA and the USSR.

The extended meeting was attended:

- on the American side by: H. D. Mehlinger, Director of the Social Studies Development Center (Indiana University) and Chairman of the Working Group, Vice-Chairman R. R. Carlson, and members of the Working Group, S. F. Abbott, C. E. Black, C. P. McDaniel, D. W. Robb, D. B. Taylor, C. D. Cary, A. Dallin, G. J. Demko, P. G. Dowling, J. B. Howard, W. Rosenberg, J. M. Thompson, J. H. Wilson, R. Jensen and J. T. Patterson.

- on the Soviet side: A. L. Narochnitsky, Academician of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences and Chairman of the Commission on the Soviet side; Vice Chairmen I. B. Berkhin, Yu. S. Kukushkin, and A. Y. Shirinsky; and Commission members Y. Y. Ivanov, E. A. Ivanyan, A. G. Koloskov, V. P. Maksakovsky, Z. A. Malkova, Y. A. Polyakov, A. A. Preobrazhensky, O. A. Rzhesheysky, G. N. Sevastyanov, I. A. Fedosov and V. K. Furayev.

The meeting had two main purposes: to review the results of the textbook reviews conducted by both sides and to discuss topics in history and geography of the Soviet Union in American textbooks and the history and geography of the United States in Soviet textbooks.

Prior to and during the conference each side distributed to the other reviews of textbooks, working papers and observations on the review process by some of the authors. Of particular importance to the meeting were a Soviet paper entitled Presentation of Soviet History in U.S. History and Geography Textbooks and an American paper entitled Review of Soviet History and Geography Textbooks: Some General Comments.

During the course of the meeting both sides reaffirmed their support for the current project and expressed a desire to bring this phase of their work to a mutually satisfactory conclusion in order to provide for the possibility of new, related activities.

Discussion took place on the kind of joint report or separate reports that should be published about the project's achievements. It was agreed that at the next meeting of the two sides, scheduled for the United States not later than March, 1980, preliminary drafts of this report or reports should be discussed. It was further agreed that each side would provide the other a draft of a joint report or of a separate report in English and Russian containing its views at least one month prior to the meeting. The sides agreed to specify the terms, the date, and the schedule of the future meeting by October 1, 1979.

The meeting took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

Despite differences of principles in approaching historical development and problems of economic geography, the discussion proved that both sides were contributing useful clarifications of facts and proposals for the improvement of the presentation of historical developments.

The two delegations consider it useful to publish information, reports, and articles about the project in their respective countries.

Chairman of the American Working Group

Howard D. Mehlinger

H. D. Mehlinger

Chairman of the Commission on the Soviet Side

A. L. Narochnitsky

Moscow
June 22, 1979

П Р О Т О К О Л

о результатах встречи советских и американских специалистов по анализу школьных учебников истории и географии

С 18 по 22 июня 1979 года в Москве состоялась встреча представителей американской и советской рабочих групп по анализу школьных учебников истории и географии, издаваемых в США и СССР. Встрече предшествовала широкого масштаба подготовительная работа.

На расширенном заседании присутствовали:
–с американской стороны: Г.Д.Мелингер, директор Центра развития социальных исследований при Университете штата Индиана и Председатель Рабочей Группы, заместитель Председателя Рабочей Группы Р.Р.Карлсон, а также члены Рабочей Группы С.Ф.Эббот, С.Е.Блэк, С.П.Макдэниел, Д.У.Робб, Д.Б.Тейлор, Ч.Д.Кари, А.Даллин, Дж.Демко, П.Дж.Даулинг, Дж.Б.Хауэрд, У.Розенберг, Дж.М.Томпсон, Дж.Х.Уилсон, Р.Дженсен, Дж.Т.Пэттерсон;
–с советской стороны: А.Л.Нарочницкий, академик Академии Наук СССР и Председатель Комиссии с советской стороны; вице-председатели И.Б.Берхин, Ю.С.Кукушкин, А.Е.Ширинский; а также члены Комиссии Ю.Ю.Иванов, Э.А.Иванян, А.Г.Колосков, В.П.Максаковский, З.А.Малькова, Ю.А.Поляков, И.А.Федосов, А.А.Преображенский, О.А.Ржешевский, Г.Н.Севастьянов и В.К.Фураев.

Встреча преследовала две главные цели: рассмотреть результаты критического обзора учебников, проведенного обеими сторонами, и обсудить темы из истории и географии СССР в американских учебниках и из истории и географии США – в советских учебниках.

До начала совещания и во время проведения его обе стороны предоставили каждая другой стороне обзоры учебников, рабочие доклады и замечания некоторых авторов по процессу обзора. Особую важность на встрече представили советский доклад, озаглавленный "Об освещении истории СССР в американских учебниках по истории и географии", и американский доклад, озаглавленный "Критический обзор советских школьных учебников по истории и географии: некоторые общие замечания".

В ходе встречи обе стороны вновь подтвердили свои намерения содействовать проведению в жизнь данной программы и выразили желание довести эту фазу своей работы до взаимоудовлетворительного завершения, с тем чтобы обеспечить возможность новых соответствующих мероприятий.

Обсуждался вопрос о характере общего доклада или отдельных докладов обеих сторон, которые следовало бы опубликовать относительно достижений в проведении программы. Было достигнуто соглашение о том, что на следующей встрече обеих сторон, намеченной для проведения в Соединенных Штатах не позднее марта 1980 года, будут рассмотрены варианты такого доклада или отдельных докладов. Стороны согласились далее предоставить друг другу выражающие точку зрения соответствующей стороны предварительные варианты общего доклада или отдельных докладов на русском и английском языке не позднее чем за месяц до встречи.

Сроки проведения встречи и программу стороны договорились согласовать до I октября 1979 года.

Встреча проходила в деловой атмосфере и носила конструктивный характер.

Несмотря на различия в принципах подхода к историческим событиям и проблемам экономической географии, дискуссия показала, что обе стороны вносили полезные разъяснения фактов и предложения по улучшению изложения исторических событий.

Обе делегации считают полезным публиковать информацию, доклады и статьи о данной программе каждая в своей стране.

Председатель
Американской Рабочей Группы
Г.Д.Мелингер

Председатель
Комиссии с советской стороны
А.Л.Нарочницкий

APENDIX D

American Participants in the US/USSR
Textbook Study Project

AMERICAN PARTICIPANTS IN THE US/USSR
TEXTBOOK STUDY PROJECT*

Director: Howard D. Mehlinger, Professor of Education and History and Director of the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University

Associate Director: Robert Carlson, Former Director of the National Program for the Advancement of Pre-College Russian and East European Studies, The University of Michigan

Advisory Committee:

Sybil Abbott, Teacher at Clayton Middle School, Reno, Nevada

C. E. Black, Professor of History and Director of the Center for International Studies, Princeton University

Fred Burke, Commissioner of Education, Trenton, New Jersey

Joseph M. Cronin, State Superintendent of Education, Springfield, Illinois

Charles McDaniel, State Superintendent of Schools for Georgia

Donald W. Robb, General Manager for Social Studies and Foreign Languages, Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company

Daniel Taylor, Superintendent of Public Instruction for West Virginia

Thomas C. Todd, Superintendent of Public Instruction for South Dakota

Panel of Readers:

Charles D. Cary, Independent Researcher and Consultant, Stockton, California

Alexander Dallin, Professor of History and Political Science, Stanford University

---

*The membership of the American team changed somewhat from the beginning of the Project to the present. This composite list contains the names of all of those who played important roles at various times. Titles and affiliations are those of the period during which the participants served.

George Demko, Professor of Geography, Ohio State University

Peter Dowling, Teacher at Bridgewater-Raritan High School East, Somerville, New Jersey

Jeanne Howard, Assistant Professor of Environmental and Urban Systems, Virginia Polytechnic and State University

William G. Rosenberg, Professor of History, University of Michigan

Robert Taaffe, Professor of Geography and Chairman, Department of Geography, Indiana University

John M. Thompson, Associate Director, American Universities Field Staff

Joan Hoff Wilson, Professor of History, Arizona State University

Special Reviewers and Consultants:

Maurice Baxter, Professor of History, Indiana University

John Gamble, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nevada

Sam Ingram, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tennessee

Robert Jensen, Professor of Geography, Syracuse University

George Juergens, Associate Professor of History, Indiana University

James Patterson, Professor of History, Brown University

Bernard Sheehan, Professor of History, Indiana University

John Wiltz, Professor of History, Indiana University

Translators:

Ben Eklof, Assistant Professor of History, Indiana University

Nadia Peterson, Lecturer, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Indiana University

APPENDIX E

Soviet Participants in the US/USSR Textbook Study Project

SOVIET PARTICIPANTS IN THE US/USSR
TEXTBOOK STUDY PROJECT*

USSR Ministry of Education: M. I. Zhuravleva, Deputy Minister for Foreign Relations

Soviet Textbook Commission:

Chairman: Aleksei L. Narochnitsky, Director of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences

Vice Presidents:

Ilia B. Berkhin, Member of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences

Iu. S. Kukushkin, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences, and a member of the History Faculty at Moscow State University

Andrei E. Shirinsky, Deputy Head of the Section for International Affairs in the Ministry of Education

Commission Members:

Igor Petrovich Dement'ev, Professor in the Department of Modern and Contemporary History, Moscow State University

I. A. Fedosov, Historian and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences and pro-rector of Moscow State University

V. K. Furaev, Head of the Department of General History, Leningrad State Pedagogical Institute, named for Herzen

Liliia Davidovna Filippova, Historian and Corresponding Member of the Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada, Academy of Sciences

Iurii Iurevich Ivanov, Head of the Section for the Administration of Schools, Ministry of Education

Edward Alexandrovich Ivaniian, Historian and Scientific Secretary of the Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada, Academy of Sciences

---

*The membership of the Soviet Textbook Commission changed during the life of the Project. This composite list contains the names of all of those who played important roles at various times.

Anatolii Glebovich Koloskov, Historian and Specialist in the Teaching of History, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences

Pavel Solomonovich Lebengrub, Specialist in the Methods of Teaching, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences

Vladimir Pavlovich Maksakovsky, Head of the Economic Geography Department, Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, named for Lenin

Zoya Alekseevna Mal'kova, Director of the Institute for General Pedagogy, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences

Iu. A. Poliakov, Head of the Section on the Soviet Period in the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences

A. A. Preobrazhensky, Head of the Section on the History of Feudalism of the Institute of History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences

O. A. Rzheshevsky, Head of the Section on World War II of the Institute of General History, Academy of Sciences

Anatolii Mikhailovich Sakharov, Historian and Member of the Department of History, Moscow State University

Grigorii Nikolaevich Sevastianov, Head of the Section of the History of the United States, Institute of General History, Academy of Sciences

Ismail Ibragimovich Sharifzhanov, Docent in the Faculty of Philosophy, Kazan State Pedagogical Institute

Nikolai Vasilevich Sivachev, Professor of Modern and Contemporary History, Moscow State University

G. A. Trukan, Head of the Section for Original Source Material on the Soviet Period, Institute of the History of the USSR, Academy of Sciences